

THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE  
OF WALKER AND STEPHENS (DIPTERA)



BY  
ROGER WARD CROSSKEY

*Pp.* 267-308

BULLETIN OF  
THE BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY)  
ENTOMOLOGY Vol. 30 No. 5  
LONDON : 1974

THE BULLETIN OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM  
(NATURAL HISTORY), *instituted in 1949, is  
issued in five series corresponding to the Departments  
of the Museum, and an Historical series.*

*Parts will appear at irregular intervals as they become  
ready. Volumes will contain about three or four  
hundred pages, and will not necessarily be completed  
within one calendar year.*

*In 1965 a separate supplementary series of longer  
papers was instituted, numbered serially for each  
Department.*

*This paper is Vol. 30 No. 5 of the Entomological  
series. The abbreviated titles of periodicals cited follow  
those of the World List of Scientific Periodicals.*

*World List abbreviation  
Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist. (Ent.)*

© Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History), 1974

TRUSTEES OF  
THE BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY)

*Issued 12 June, 1974*

*Price £2.10*

# THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE OF WALKER AND STEPHENS (DIPTERA)

By R. W. CROSSKEY

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
SYNOPSIS . . . . .	269
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	269
RECOGNITION OF WALKER'S BRITISH TYPES . . . . .	270
HOLOTYPE OR LECTOTYPE? THE STATUS OF A SINGLE EXTANT TYPE FROM A TYPE-SERIES OF UNKNOWN SIZE . . . . .	272
EXPLANATORY COMMENTS ON THE FORMAT ADOPTED . . . . .	275
WALKER'S NAMES IN THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE . . . . .	276
WALKER'S NAMES FOR TACHINIDAE OF UNCERTAIN ORIGIN BUT PROBABLY BRITISH . . . . .	292
STEPHENS'S NAMES IN THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE . . . . .	293
THE STATUS, IDENTITY AND SYNONYMY OF THE GENERIC NAME <i>Triarthria</i> STEPHENS . . . . .	295
NAMES OF WALKER AND STEPHENS PURPORTEDLY FOR THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE BUT APPLYING IN OTHER FAMILIES . . . . .	297
LECTOTYPE DESIGNATIONS FOR SOME NOMINAL SPECIES DESCRIBED BY FALLÉN . . . . .	300
SUMMARY OF NEW SYNONYMS AND NEW COMBINATIONS . . . . .	304
SUMMARY OF CONFIRMED SYNONYMS . . . . .	305
SUMMARY OF <i>Nomina dubia</i> . . . . .	306
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	306
REFERENCES . . . . .	306

## SYNOPSIS

The results are presented of an investigation into the long-neglected names that Walker and Stephens proposed for British Tachinidae or British species ascribed to Tachinid genera. The identities of the species to which the names apply are established after study of the extant types: types are lost of nearly half of Walker's British nominal species and 56 names remain *nomina dubia*. Nineteen previously established specific synonyms are confirmed, 49 new specific synonyms are established, and there are four new combinations. Lectotypes are designated for 13 nominal species, three of Walker and ten of Fallén (the latter being senior synonyms of Walker names). The generic name *Triarthria* Stephens is shown to be available and is established as a senior synonym for *Bigonicheta* Rondani; two other generic names are placed as new synonyms of *Triarthria*.

## INTRODUCTION

It is a fact of taxonomic life that to ignore names does not make them go away, yet it has been the practice among British dipterists – it seems almost wilfully – to neglect the names proposed for British flies by Walker and Stephens. To disregard

the names of Stephens was perhaps permissible as they were almost all *nomina nuda*, but Walker's names were accompanied by detailed (albeit fairly useless) descriptions, and, furthermore, were nearly all published in the easily accessible work entitled *Insecta Britannica, Diptera* (volumes 1-3). Earlier generations of dipterists can therefore hardly have the excuse that they did not know of Walker's work.

Neglect of Walker's British Tachinidae has been almost total, despite the fact that they muster (including those described in *Tachina* Meigen but known not to be true Tachinidae) no fewer than 117 nominal species. None of the specialists on British Tachinidae (Wainwright, Day, van Emden) mentioned any of Walker's species or placed any of his names, and regrettably they were all omitted by Kloet & Hincks (1945) from their *A Check List of British Insects*.

The preparation of the Diptera volume for the revised edition of 'Kloet & Hincks' has prompted the present study of the British Tachinidae described or named by Walker and Stephens, so that the names can be placed as reliably as possible, and the omission from the first edition remedied. The essence of a good catalogue or check-list is that it should at least account for all the names involved in the group under consideration, even if those names cannot in the state of knowledge be accurately interpreted and even if they lack status in zoological nomenclature. In this respect, it is of interest to note, the early Diptera lists of White (1853) and Verrall (1888; 1901) were superior to the list of Kloet & Hincks (1945) since they did at least record some or most of Walker's British names. These lists all omitted Stephens's names, probably because they are almost all *nomina nuda*, but it has been thought logical to account for Stephens's names in the present paper because some of them were used and given nomenclatural availability by Walker (who had access to the Stephens collection).

Type-specimens have been located for about half of the nominal species here concerned that Walker described; the remainder have not been found and are deemed to be lost. Most of the types are in the British Museum (Natural History) and were found in a special cabinet containing the amalgamated remnants of Stephens's and Walker's collections of Diptera; they have now been removed from this cabinet and placed together in a drawer in the collection of British dipterous types. A few types are in the University Museum, Oxford, these all being specimens that Walker described from the collection (now mostly lost) of Desvignes.

The interpretations of names after study of the types, or decisions as to their status in the absence of types, that are given in this paper form the basis upon which the Walker and Stephens names will be recorded in the forthcoming Diptera volume of the new Kloet & Hincks's *Check List of British Insects*.

#### RECOGNITION OF WALKER'S BRITISH TYPES

Francis Walker described 116 nominal species from 'England' that he assigned to the genus *Tachina* Meigen and one nominal species from 'England' that he assigned to the genus *Dexia* Meigen. In addition to these he described three nominal species (one *Dexia*, two *Tachina*) from unknown localities that almost



certainly had a British provenance, and published four replacement names for his own homonyms. There is therefore a total of 124 Walker names for British Tachinidae and allied forms to be accounted for in the British fauna.

These names were published in only two works, namely Walker's (1849) *List of the Specimens of Dipterous Insects in the Collection of the British Museum* (Vol. 4), and his (1853) *Insecta Britannica, Diptera* (Vol. 2). Twenty-four of the nominal species were described in the 1849 work and the other 96 in the 1853 work; the latter also contains the four replacement names.

The type-specimens of the nominal species described in 1849 were all found in the collection of the British Museum (Natural History) many years ago and labelled to show their identity by Major E. E. Austen. Each such type bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen wrote the name in black ink, and usually also a pencilled label in Austen's hand reading 'England'. Some of these types were the subject of published notes by Austen (1907) indicating their identities. The recognition of Walker's (1849) types therefore presented no problems.

The type-specimens on which Walker's (1853) descriptions were based had not, however, been previously recognized and labelled as such except for a few which Walker had recorded as being in Desvignes's collection; a few specimens were found in the University Museum at Oxford and in the British Museum (Natural History) (hereafter abbreviated to BMNH) bearing old labels that gave a Walker name and the statement '. . . Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' (the hand-writing being unrecognized but possibly Verrall's) and comparison of such specimens with the descriptions left no doubt that they are indeed primary types of the nominal species named on the labels.

Most of the extant Walker (1853) types are in the BMNH and stood amongst the Stephens collection, but when found were easily differentiated from Stephens's own specimens by the nature of the labels standing beneath the specimens. The specimens themselves bore no labels, but the identities were at once evident from printed name labels associated with the specimens and pinned into the Stephens-Walker cabinet just below them; comparison of the specimens so-named with the descriptions showed that the labelling could be relied upon. The printed labels were found to be of two kinds, and it was quickly obvious that one kind had been cut from Stephens's (1829a) *Nomenclature of British Insects* and the other kind from White's (1853) *List of the Specimens of British Animals in the Collection of the British Museum*, Part XV (Diptera). The kind of label differentiated the older Stephens material from the later Walker material that had been placed with it.

The Stephens name labels consist simply of his name for the species in Roman type followed by his 'mihi' suffix in italics: e.g. 'nigrolineata *mihi*'. The White name labels for Walker's species consist of a serial number, followed by the specific name in Roman type and Walker's abbreviated name in italics: e.g. '122 *delitescens Walk.*'.

It is important to note a cause of consistent discrepancy of one number between the serial numbers given by Walker (1853) to his species and the serial numbers given in White's list. Walker's (1853) serial numbers for his species of British *Tachina* ran from No. 1 on p. 19 to No. 166 on p. 92, but there was no species with

the serial number 51 and Walker himself noted this omission in a footnote on p. 41; thus Walker's series went from '50 *exacta*' to '52 *agilis*'. White (1853) produced his list from Walker's (1853) publication, which had just appeared in the same year, but to avoid the omission of No. 51 he renumbered all of Walker's series from 52 onwards; thus *agilis* became 51, not 52, and so on throughout the series to the last *Tachina* species which became 165, not 166. As a result, the printed numbers on the White labels (which are now removed from the cabinet and attached to the appropriate types) when in excess of 51 all differ by one from the serial number given by Walker and quoted in the references to the nominal species in the present listing.

In none of his descriptions of British Tachinidae did Walker state either the sex or the number of specimens he had, and for only two nominal species out of the sixty for which surviving type-material has been found is there more than one original type (these are *T. commissa* and *T. intersecta* for which two syntypes each have been found and for which lectotypes are designated). The presumption is, therefore, that virtually all of Walker's nominal species were based on a single specimen, since there is no contrary evidence in the descriptions (such as a size range); the only exception to this is *T. comosa* for which a size range is given, thus suggesting at least two original specimens (only one exists and is designated as lectotype). It is specially likely that Walker had only one specimen of nearly all his species because he had no idea, it seems, of intraspecific variability: Austen (1907: 326) pointed this out in a little-known remark that deserves quotation: 'As proving that Walker described the *specimen*, and not the species, the characters of which he was generally incapable of grasping, it may be mentioned that he is responsible for no fewer than eleven synonyms of the well-known *Eutachina rustica*, Mg. [now *Exorista rustica*], the description in every case being based upon a single specimen.'

When only a single type-specimen has been found, and there is no evidence that more than one original specimen existed, that type-specimen has been accepted and is cited as the 'holotype', since it is in my view undesirable to adopt the practice of some workers and designate such specimens as lectotypes. (This is elaborated further in the following section.)

#### HOLOTYPE OR LECTOTYPE? THE STATUS OF A SINGLE EXTANT TYPE FROM A TYPE-SERIES OF UNKNOWN SIZE

Sooner or later every practising taxonomist, at least in the field of entomology, meets the situation where for some particular nominal species-group taxon three factors coincide: (1) there was no originally designated type-specimen; (2) it cannot be ascertained with certainty how many specimens composed the type-series; and (3) only one extant type-specimen can be found. Such situations are commonplace, especially when dealing with the type-material of pre-20th century authors for whom it was not the custom to state how many specimens they had before them when drawing up their descriptions.

The question then arises – what is the status of the single extant type-specimen?

Should it be treated as the *holotype*, on the assumption that no other original specimens existed, until proved otherwise, or should it be designated as the *lectotype* on the assumption that it was probably only one of a multiple type-series?

In practice it appears that most taxonomists answer these questions by following what others do in their particular group, rather than by deliberating on the balance of the arguments and deciding for themselves: in this way it has come about, for instance, that dipterists tend to be 'holotypists' and hemipterists tend to be 'lectotypists'. Each group tends to cling rather tenaciously to its viewpoint and to quote the gospel of the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature* in defence of it; yet the *Code* is in reality none too helpful on the point, particularly as it implies two definitions for a 'holotype' in Article 73 but only one in the Glossary (an anomaly touched upon further below).

It seems to me that the arguments are overwhelmingly in favour of treating single extant types (of the kind under discussion) as holotypes, and therefore against their designation as lectotypes, and it is my aim in the present section to put forward the reasons for this viewpoint. The principles that I apply in the present paper, and have consistently applied in taxonomic practice, may be put into words as follows:

- (1) *If a nominal species-group taxon was based upon an unstated number of specimens and had no originally designated type-specimen, a single extant type is the holotype (unless contrary evidence from any source exists or until it is obtained).*
- (2) *If it is later proved that other type-material exists then the specimen hitherto recognized as holotype becomes one of a syntype series from which any specimen may be designated as the lectotype.*

There is nothing in the procedure just outlined that, in my view at least, could be considered contrary either to the letter or the spirit of Article 73 of the *Code*. In this Article it is made clear that there are *two* circumstances in which a nominal species has a holotype (the *Code* uses 'species' but 'species-group taxon' is meant): the first circumstance (lettered '(a)' in the *Code*) is that in which the nominal species 'is based on a single specimen', *without any qualification requiring that this is made evident in the original publication*: the second circumstance (lettered '(b)' in the *Code*) is that in which the describer designates or indicates in the original description that only one specimen is the 'type'. Regrettably, however, the Glossary (*Code*, p. 149) defines 'holotype' in only *one* way, namely as the kind of holotype specified in Article 73(b), and in this respect there is a discrepancy between the text of the *Code* and its Glossary. In this situation it should be the text that is definitive, and it follows therefore that a type-specimen of the kind defined in the text of Article 73(a) is just as much a 'holotype' as the kind referred to in Article 73(b) and the Glossary.

It is clear from this that when only one type-specimen of a nominal species-group taxon can be found, and there is no originally designated 'type' or evidence of the number of original specimens, that extant type-specimen *can* be the holotype (i.e. there are no grounds under the *Code* for supposing that it should automatically



be designated as the lectotype even though it is theoretically possible that the one extant specimen is the only survivor from a multiple type-series). It is my argument here that it is, in fact, undesirable on several grounds to designate such a specimen as lectotype (even though it can permissibly be so designated under the *Code*). The main objections to lectotype designation may be put as follows:

- (1) It is binding on future zoologists and ties the name in perpetuity to the one extant specimen.

[It may be that the extant specimen is damaged or belongs to the sex not habitually carrying the best characters. A subsequently discovered syntype could not be made the name-bearing specimen, even though it might have been a better specimen for lectotype designation either on practical or nomenclatural grounds.]

- (2) It is based on the subjective surmise that the type-series consisted of multiple specimens.

[It is objective fact that there must have been at least one original specimen whereas it is in the realm of conjecture that there were more.]

- (3) It is, for most groups at least, contrary to probability that the type-series ever contained more than a single specimen.

[It is mainly the species-group taxa of early authors that are involved in the situations under discussion. In these earlier times it was commonplace for taxa to be described from lone specimens, though in certain orders it was more usual than in others for describers to have more than one original specimen. For many groups, at least, single type-specimens were the norm upon which nominal species-group taxa were based.]

- (4) It imposes upon later workers the obligation to cite the names of the designators and the references to the designations (e.g. in catalogues).

[This is a minor objection but relevant, since the imposition is a needless one.]

- (5) It will incline other workers to presuppose the existence of paralectotypes when none in fact exist.

[The very fact of designation of a lectotype leads other workers immediately to assume that evidence exists that the original material consisted of two or more syntypes, whereas in the cases here concerned there is no such evidence. Lectotype designation and the absence of paralectotypes could be confusing to other workers, since designation of a lectotype normally *implies* very strongly either that multiple syntypes still exist or that there is certain evidence that they once existed.]

The reasons why I prefer to recognize single extant type-specimens of the kind under discussion as holotypes, and not to designate them as lectotypes, can be inferred from the arguments against lectotype designation adduced above, but it may nevertheless be useful to summarize them thus:

Recognition as holotype: (1) does not tie the hands of a future zoologist if additional type-specimens are discovered, who remains free to designate the most appropriate specimen; (2) is consonant with the fact that at least one specimen *must* have

existed whereas more than one *may* have existed; (3) is consonant with the fact that most frequently the description would have been based only on one specimen; (4) imposes no practical 'recording' burden on other workers; and (5) does not mislead other workers into assuming that syntypes were known positively to exist or have existed.

From item (1) enumerated above it will be evident that recognition of the single extant specimen does not, in my view, automatically make it a lectotype if other specimens (syntypes) are discovered. (Here it may be noted that there are, of course, many instances in taxonomic practice where an author is deemed to have fixed a lectotype, even though he did not use this term for the single name-bearing specimen; in these instances the author was aware at the time of his publication that more than one original specimen existed and his citation of one specimen, by whatever terminology, as type had the intention of fixing the name to that specimen.)

#### EXPLANATORY COMMENTS ON THE FORMAT ADOPTED

The nominal species-group taxa are listed in alphabetical order of their original combinations, and for each name the entry is arranged in the following sequence.

Name; author; date and page reference of original publication; serial number of the nominal species in the original publication (if any); status and sex of primary type (if known); present lectotype designation (when necessary); locality of primary type; type-depository.

Number and sex of paralectotypes if such exist, with data and depository information as for primary types.

Statement on the condition and labelling of the type-material.

A statement (prefixed '*Identity*.') on the generic placement and taxonomic validity of the name, accompanied when known by similar data to that outlined above for the names of senior or junior synonyms.

The following points should be noted with regard to the information supplied:

1. *Lost types*. For many nominal species the type-material is lost and there is no evidence on the number of original specimens or their sex; in these cases the statement 'Type(s) [? sex]' is used to indicate the lack of information. Very rarely it is clear from a size range given in the description that there must have been at least two specimens, and such cases are recorded as 'Syntypes [? sex]'. When types have not been located the word 'lost' is given in parentheses after the locality.

2. *Locality*. The British Tachinidae described by Walker were all recorded as from England without any further locality data. In the 1853 work Walker indicated this locality simply by use of the letter 'E'. The locality has been recorded simply as 'ENGLAND'.

3. *Type-depositories*. As these are given for the primary types of the synonyms of Walker's names as well as for Walker's nominal species there are several type-depositories involved. The following abbreviations are used to indicate these:

BMNH British Museum (Natural History), London.

MNHN Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.

MZ	Museo Zoologico 'La Specola', Florence.
NM	Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna.
NR	Naturhistoriska Riksmuseum, Stockholm.
UM	University Museum, Oxford.
UZI	Universitetets Zoologiska Institution, Lund.

## WALKER'S NAMES IN THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE

*Note:* names of nominal species that were assigned by Walker to *Tachina* but are now known not to apply to Tachinidae are included, for convenient cross-reference, in the list that follows but are printed in non-bold italics and are enclosed in square brackets. Names that are junior homonyms are in non-bold italics but not bracketed. The numbers given in brackets following the page-references are the serial numbers given to the nominal species by Walker with the original descriptions.

***Dexia fingens*** Walker, 1853 : 98 (No. 7). Type(s) [♂], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Walker's (1853 : 94-99) sense of *Dexia* Meigen included species now assigned to the genera *Mintho* Robineau-Desvoidy, *Estheria* Robineau-Desvoidy, *Phyllomya* Robineau-Desvoidy, *Thelaira* Robineau-Desvoidy and *Dexiosoma* Rondani. It is impossible to deduce the identity of *D. fingens* from the description, although this clearly applies to a male specimen.

***Tachina accidens*** Walker, 1853 : 89 (No. 160). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has the thoracic dorsum damaged, has lost the last four segments of each hind tarsus and has some fungal threads, but is otherwise in good condition. It bears a printed label '159 accidens Walk'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Phyllomya volvulus*** (Fabricius, 1794 : 328 (*Musca*)), type(s) [? sex], ITALY (lost or destroyed, except one wing).

***Tachina admete*** Walker, 1849 : 743. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has lost the left fore and mid legs, the right mid leg, and some setae, and the thorax is greasy. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Exorista (Adenia) rustica*** (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *admete* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and has been confirmed during the present work by examination of the holotype genitalia.

***Tachina ambivius*** Walker, 1849 : 754. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND [?] (BMNH).

The holotype is in fair condition, but has lost both hind legs and the left arista; the mesonotum and scutellum are rubbed and most of the frontal setae are missing. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink, and a label in Wainwright's writing that reads 'CHAETOLYA ambivius Walk = setigena Rond ♀'.

*Identity.* Valid senior synonym for *Chetina setigena* Rondani, new combination ***Chetina ambivius*** (Walker) **comb. n.** here established. *C. setigena* Rondani, 1856 : 65, holotype [? sex], ITALY (MZ, Florence) [examined by Herting], here established as a junior synonym (**syn. n.**) of *C. ambivius* (Walker, 1849).

Dr Herting has examined the holotype of *ambivius* and confirms that the name applies to the same species as Rondani's *setigena*. Wainwright had evidently realized this, as he had attached a label to the holotype indicating the synonymy, but so far as I can trace the

synonymy was not established by Wainwright in publication and is therefore new. (The generic name *Chaetolya* on Wainwright's label is a variant spelling of *Chetilya* Rondani, 1861, which itself appears to be a variant spelling of *Chetilia* Rondani, 1859, and is a junior synonym of *Chetina* Rondani, 1856; the last is also commonly known by the variant spelling *Chaetina*.)

The species here concerned, formerly known as *Chetina setigena*, is not known to be a British species, and it therefore appears possible that the holotype of *ambivius* does not have a British provenance. Walker recorded the locality as 'England' in the description, and Austen has attached a pencilled label to the holotype indicating England as type-locality, but there is no means now of discovering whether the specimen truly originated in Britain. *Chetina ambivius* (Walker) is mainly a central European species, and must be treated as very doubtfully British in the absence of later material confirming its existence in the British fauna.

***Tachina amphi*** Walker, 1849 : 749. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in poor condition; the left legs, right fore leg and left wing are lost, the right wing damaged, the head badly crushed and the body greasy. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Phryxe heraclei* (Meigen, 1824 : 339 (*Tachina*)), holotype ♂, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting]. Austen (1907 : 329) placed *amphi* as a synonym of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén, 1810), which was justified in the state of knowledge at that time, but examination of the holotype genitalia during the present work showed that *amphi* is actually a synonym of *heraclei*, not of *vulgaris*.

***Tachina augens*** Walker, 1853 : 73 (No. 124). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. The identity cannot be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 18) key placement, in which he associated *augens* (No. 124) with *delitescens* Walker (No. 123). The name appears certainly to have applied to a Tachinid.

***Tachina bijuncta*** Walker, 1853 : 24 (No. 12). Type(s) [? ♂], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Bezzi (1907 : 211) doubtfully assigned *bijuncta* to *Ernestia* (*Ernestia*) Robineau-Desvoidy, presumably from the description, but there is nothing sufficiently tangible in the original description or in the key placement (Walker, 1853 : 15) for reliable generic assignment. Walker associated *bijuncta* in his key with *dispartita* Walker (No. 10) and *intracta* Walker (No. 11) but types of these are also lost.

***Tachina broteas*** Walker, 1849 : 763. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has lost all left legs, the right fore leg and some scutellar setae, and has a tear near the base of the left wing but is otherwise in fair condition.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Actia pilipennis* (Fallén, 1810 : 273 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *broteas* with *pilipennis* was first established by Austen (1907 : 339) and is here confirmed after direct comparison of the primary types.

[*Tachina caminaria* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

***Tachina cerceis*** Walker, 1849 : 747. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in very good condition. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *cerceis* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed.

***Tachina certans*** Walker, 1853 : 74 (No. 125). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).



The holotype is in very good condition except for the loss of some tarsal segments. It bears a printed label '124 certans Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Timavia amoena* (Meigen, 1824 : 264 (*Tachina*)), syntypes ♂ ♀, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

***Tachina clymene*** Walker, 1849 : 784. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of the left fore leg and tip of the right hind tarsus. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Zophomyia temula* (Scopoli, 1763 : 330 (*Musca*)), type(s) [? sex], AUSTRIA (lost).

***Tachina collecta*** Walker, 1853 : [298]. Replacement name for *Tachina neglecta* Walker, 1853 : 79, primary homonym of *Tachina neglecta* Walker, 1853 : 25.

Walker (1853) described two different species with the name *Tachina neglecta*, but published the replacement name *T. collecta* for the second use of the name *neglecta* in a table of 'Errata' on an unnumbered page immediately following the last numbered page of the work (p. 297). Type-information for *T. collecta* is given under *T. neglecta* (2), q.v.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén, 1810 : 282 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♀ holotype of *collecta* = *neglecta* has been directly compared with ♀ paralectotypes of *vulgaris* as well as with the ♂ lectotype.

***Tachina comitata*** Walker, 1853 : 55 (No. 83). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. The identity cannot be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *comitata* (No. 83) with *distenta* (No. 82); the type of the latter is also lost. *T. comitata* was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina comissa*** Walker, 1853 : 69 (No. 114). LECTOTYPE ♀, by present designation, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Desvignes).

Paralectotype: ♀, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The lectotype has lost the abdomen and the right hind leg but, apart from rubbing of the frontal setae, is otherwise in good condition. The paralectotype is in extremely bad condition, abdomen and mid and hind legs and right wing lost, both third antennal segments lost and a large hole in the thoracic dorsum; the parts that remain are mouldy. Lectotype and paralectotype are each labelled '*T. comissa*. Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Lypha dubia* (Fallén, 1810 : 284 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The type-material of *comissa* has been directly compared with ♀ paralectotypes of *dubia* as well as with the ♂ lectotype. Bezzi (1907 : 222) wrongly placed *comissa* as a possible synonym of *Lydina aenea* (Meigen).

***Tachina comosa*** Walker, 1853 : 75 (No. 128). LECTOTYPE ♂, by present designation, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The description of this species gives a size range for body and wing length, from which fact it is evident that there was more than one original specimen. Only one syntype, however, has been found and this is designated as lectotype. The lectotype is in good condition except for a little mould and loss of the right fore tarsus; it bears a printed label '127 comosa Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Lypha dubia* (Fallén, 1810 : 284 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♂ lectotypes of *comosa* and *dubia* have been directly compared.

***Tachina computa*** Walker, 1853 : 64 (No. 103). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in bad condition, very mouldy, both wings torn, left fore and hind legs lost, left mid tarsus lost, and right fore tarsus lost. It bears a printed label '102 computa Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Campogaster exigua*** (Meigen, 1824: 367 (*Tachina*)), holotype ♂, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

***Tachina confecta*** Walker, 1853 : [298]. Replacement name for *Tachina defecta* Walker, 1853 : 46, primary homonym of *Tachina defecta* Walker, 1853 : 27.

Walker (1853) described two different species with the name *Tachina defecta*, but published the replacement name *T. confecta* for the second use of the name *defecta* in a table of 'Errata' on an unnumbered page immediately following the last numbered page of the work (p. 297). White (1853 : 22) published the name *Tachina walkeri* as a replacement name for the second use of *T. defecta* (evidently not appreciating that Walker had himself dealt with the homonymy), and *walkeri* White is therefore a synonym of *confecta* Walker.

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium* as the type-material of *defecta* (2) is lost and nothing reliable can be deduced from the description.

***Tachina conjuncta*** Walker, 1853 : 59 (No. 91). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost)

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Verrall (1888 : 21) assigned *conjuncta* to *Nemoraea* Robineau-Desvoidy, but later (Verrall, 1901 : 25) listed *conjuncta* as a synonym of *Erigone strenua* (Meigen). On the basis of Verrall's (1901) placement, Bezzi (1907 : 218) listed *conjuncta* as a synonym of *Ernestia rudis* (Fallén, 1810), of which *E. strenua* (Meigen, 1824) is a synonym. It is unknown what evidence Verrall may have had for his placement of the name, but as Walker's description of *conjuncta* is at variance with the characters of *E. rudis* the synonymy given by Verrall and Bezzi is not accepted here (the size alone, in the original description, contra-indicates their synonymy).

***Tachina constans*** Walker, 1853 : 75 (No. 129). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has lost both hind legs, the left fore leg and the right mid leg, and the abdomen is impaled on the pin separately from the rest of the specimen; the thorax has some mould but the bristling is well preserved. It bears a printed label '128 constans Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Phryxe vulgaris*** (Fallén, 1810 : 282 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♀ holotype of *constans* has been directly compared with ♀ paralectotypes of *vulgaris* as well as with the ♂ lectotype.

[*Tachina contempta* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

***Tachina contracta*** Walker, 1853 : 24 (No. 13). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Bezzi (1907 : 212) listed *contracta* as a doubtful species of *Ernestia* Robineau-Desvoidy, evidently deducing this possibility from the description. There is insufficient evidence that *contracta* is an *Ernestia* to accept this placement, and in the absence of type-material the identity is impossible to determine.

***Tachina crisia*** Walker, 1849 : 738. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in very good condition except for loss of the right mid leg. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name and sex in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Eurithia anthophila*** (Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 66 (*Erigone*)), syntypes ♂ ♀, FRANCE (lost). Austen (1907 : 329) placed *crisia* as a synonym of *Ernestia* (*Erigone*) *radicum* (sensu Fabricius, not Linnaeus) which is the species to which the name *anthophila* rightly applies.

***Tachina defecta*** Walker, 1853 : 27 (No. 18). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The holotype is in poor condition with both mid and hind legs lost, most of left fore tarsus lost, and most of the left wing lost; the body is dirty and rather mouldy. It bears a label

reading '*T. defecta* Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Billaea irrorata* (Meigen, 1826 : 44 (*Dexia*)), holotype ♂, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting]. Verrall (1888 : 22) placed *defecta* as a possible species of *Dexia* Meigen.

*Tachina defecta* Walker, 1853 : 46 (No. 61). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost). Primary homonym of *T. defecta* Walker (1853 : 27).

Walker (1853 : [298]) published the replacement name *Tachina confecta* (q.v.), and White (1853 : 22) published the replacement name *Tachina walkeri*, for Walker's second use of the name *T. defecta*. See under *T. confecta*, above, for a note on the identity.

*Tachina delitescens* Walker, 1853 : 73 (No. 123). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has lost the left hind leg, left fore tarsus and most of the left mid tarsus, but is otherwise in good condition except for a little mould. It bears a printed label '122 delitescens Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Timavia amoena* (Meigen, 1824 : 264 (*Tachina*)), syntypes ♂ ♀, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

*Tachina demissa* Walker, 1853 : 78 (No. 135). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing can be deduced about the identity from the original description or from Walker's (1853 : 18) key placement, in which he associated *demissa* with *denotans* (= *Dinera grisescens*), *contempta* (= *Sarcophaga* s.l. sp.) and *objecta* (identity unknown).

*Tachina demota* Walker, 1853 : 61 (No. 96). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has lost all left legs and the right fore tarsus, and is rather dirty with greased head, but is otherwise in fairly good condition. It has a printed label '95 demota Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 112, type(s) [? sex], FRANCE (lost).

*Tachina denotans* Walker, 1853 : 77 (No. 132). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in good condition except for having lost both mid legs and the left third antennal segment. It has a printed label '131 denotans Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Dinera grisescens* (Fallén, 1816 : 243 (*Musca*)), holotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined]. The ♂ holotypes of *denotans* and *grisescens* have been directly compared.

*Tachina detracta* Walker, 1853 : 22 (No. 8). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium* though undoubtedly applying in the Ernestiini. Walker's description and his key placement (Walker, 1853 : 15) in a group with *caesia* Fallén (No. 7) and *puparum* Fabricius ? (No. 9) undoubtedly indicate that the name *detracta* applied to a species of Ernestiini, but it is impossible to determine which of the several British species of this tribe he had before him. Bezzi (1907 : 212) listed *detracta* as a possible species of *Ernestia* Robineau-Desvoidy.

*Tachina diniele* Walker, 1849 : 771. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has lost the left mid leg and most of the left fore tarsus and a few setae but is otherwise in good condition. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Pales pumicata* (Meigen, 1824 : 397 (*Tachina*)), syntypes 3 ♂ [1 misassociated] GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].



***Tachina discrepans*** Walker, 1853 : 54 (No. 80). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The holotype is very dirty with mould and has lost the left mid and hind legs and the right fore leg, but the chaetotaxy is well preserved. It bears a label reading '*T. Discrepans*. Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting.

**Identity.** **Syn. n. of *Lydella grisescens*** Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 112, type(s) [? sex], FRANCE (lost). Verrall (1888 : 21) incorrectly assigned *discrepans* to the genus *Masicera* Macquart, and evidently on the basis of this Bezzi (1907 : 283) included the name in his list of 'Species dubiae' of *Masicera*.

***Tachina disjuncta*** Walker, 1853 : 44 (No. 58). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost). Junior primary homonym of *Tachina disiuncta* Wiedemann, 1824.

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Bezzi (1907 : 336) placed *disjuncta* as a synonym of *Exorista larvarum* (Linnaeus) but there appears to be no evidence in support of this placement; Bezzi cited no reference for the name other than the original, and Verrall's (1888; 1901) lists had simply recorded *disjuncta* under *Tachina* without suggesting any synonymy. It is not known why Bezzi placed *disjuncta* in synonymy with *larvarum*, especially as there is nothing in the description which specially supports such placement.

Walker's *disjuncta* is here considered to be a junior primary homonym of *Tachina disjuncta* Wiedemann, although the original spelling of the latter specific name was *disiuncta*. The 'i' and 'j' difference is not one of the variable spelling situations covered by Code Article 58, but clearly should be under the spirit if not the letter of this Article.

***Tachina dispartita*** Walker, 1853 : 23 (No. 10). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the original description or from Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement in which he associated *dispartita* with *bijuncta* (No. 12) and *intracta* (No. 11); types of these are also lost. Bezzi (1907 : 212) listed *dispartita* as possibly a species of *Ernestia* Robineau-Desvoidy, which could be correct, but there is nothing to substantiate it.

***Tachina dispecta*** Walker, 1853 : 60 (No. 94). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Verrall (1888 : 21) assigned *dispecta* to the genus *Nemoraea* Robineau-Desvoidy, but later placed the name as a synonym of *Winthemia quadripustulata* (Fabricius, 1794) (cited by Verrall as *Chaetolyga quadripustulata*). Bezzi (1907 : 231) accepted Verrall's (1901) synonymy. No evidence is available that Verrall actually saw type-specimens, and his 1901 placement seems to be a guess from the original description (perhaps largely based on Walker's description of the abdomen as 'obconico tessellato, apice rufo'). Though the description of the abdomen fits *quadripustulata* there are other parts of the description (such as 'palpi black', emphasised by Walker in italics) that contra-indicate this species. Evidence that *dispecta* was a *Winthemia* Robineau-Desvoidy is inconclusive and the name is best left standing as a *nomen dubium*. The species was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina dispuncta*** Walker, 1853 : 57 (No. 87). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the original description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement.

***Tachina distenta*** Walker, 1853 : 55 (No. 82). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the original description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *distenta* (No. 82) with *comitata* (No. 83); the type-material of the latter is also lost. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

***Tachina disterminea*** Walker, 1853 : 61 (No. 95). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype is in good condition except that the left arista and the left mid leg from the

middle of the tibia are lost, and the ptilinum extruded. It bears a printed label '94 distermina Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Phryxe vulgaris*** (Fallén, 1810 : 282 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♀ holotype of *distermina* has been directly compared with ♀ paralectotypes of *vulgaris* as well as with the ♂ lectotype.

***Tachina divulsa*** Walker, 1853 : 45 (No. 59). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the original description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement. The species was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina domator*** Walker, 1853 : 62 (No. 97). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the original description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *divulsa* with some other nominal species known to belong in Eryciini. The species was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina effecta*** Walker, 1853 : 51 (No. 74). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement.

***Tachina emissa*** Walker, 1853 : 49 (No. 68). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement, in which he associated *emissa* with three other nominal species, one of which (No. 70) is now known to be an *Exorista* Meigen. The species was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina enodata*** Walker, 1853 : 57 (No. 86). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *enodata* with *fulgens* Meigen. The latter is now known to be a synonym of *Linnaemya comta* (Fallén). It is of interest to note that in the genus *Linnaemya* Robineau-Desvoidy the palpi are vestigial and that Walker, contrary to his usual practice, did not mention the palpi in the description of *enodata*; it is certainly possible that *enodata* was described from a specimen of *Linnaemya*, but in the absence of adequate confirmation the name *enodata* must remain a *nomen dubium*.

***Tachina enotata*** Walker, 1853 : 48 (No. 67). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement, in which he grouped *enotata* (No. 67) with *interclusa* (No. 66); the type-material of the latter is also lost.

***Tachina erecta*** Walker, 1853 : 76 (No. 131). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 18) key placement. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

***Tachina erogata*** Walker, 1853 : 54 (No. 79). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *erogata* (No. 79) with *immissa* (No. 77) (= *Lydella grisescens*) and *involuta* (No. 78) (identity unknown).

***Tachina evidens*** Walker, 1853 : 42 (No. 54). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement, in which he associated *evidens* (No. 54) with *intacta* (No. 55), of which the type-material is also lost.

***Tachina evocata*** Walker, 1853 : 38 (No. 43). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement. Bezzi (1907 : 283) listed *evocata* in his 'Species dubiae' of *Masicera* Macquart, evidently having taken this from Verrall's (1888, pt. 2 : 4) tentative placement of *evocata* as a *Masicera* species.

***Tachina evoluta*** Walker, 1853 : 40 (No. 48). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement.

***Tachina exacta*** Walker, 1853 : 41 (No. 50). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Verrall (1888 : 21) assigned *exacta* to the genus *Nemoraea* Robineau-Desvoidy, but later placed the name as a synonym of *Timavia amoena* (Meigen, 1824) (cited by Verrall as *Chaetolyga amoena*). Bezzi (1907 : 229) accepted Verrall's synonymy. No evidence is available that Verrall actually saw type-specimens of *exacta*, and discrepancies between its description and the characters of *amoena* make it unlikely that Walker's nominal species is truly synonymous with Meigen's. The name *exacta* is therefore not accepted as a synonym of *amoena*, and remains a *nomen dubium*.

***Tachina exagens*** Walker, 1853 : 60 (No. 93). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *exagens* (as No. 93) with several other numbered species; the associated species, where the identities are known, belong in the Eryciini and it is probable that *exagens* was an Eryciine. The species was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina excessa*** Walker, 1853 : 65 (No. 105). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in good condition except that it has lost the right hind leg and the left third antennal segment, and carries some fungal threads. It bears a printed label '104 excessa Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Dufouria nigrita* (Fallén, 1810 : 286 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♀ holotype of *excessa* has been directly compared with the ♀ paralectotypes of *nigrita* as well as with the ♂ lectotype.

***Tachina exclusa*** Walker, 1853 : [298]. Replacement name for *Tachina interclusa* Walker, 1853 : 48, primary homonym of *Tachina interclusa* Walker, 1853 : 32.

Walker (1853) described two different species with the name *Tachina interclusa*, but published the replacement name *T. exclusa* for the second use of the name *interclusa* in a table of 'Errata' on an unnumbered page immediately following the last numbered page of the work (p. 297).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium* as the type-material of *interclusa* (2) is lost and nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or key placement.

[*Tachina expetita* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

***Tachina expleta*** Walker, 1853 : 55 (No. 81). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he did not associate *expleta* with other species.

***Tachina excensa*** Walker, 1853 : 66 (No. 108). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype is in good condition except for the loss of the left fore and mid legs. It bears a printed label '107 excensa Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Actia pilipennis* (Fallén, 1810 : 273 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♀ holotype of *excensa*



has been directly compared with the ♀ paralectotypes of *pilipennis* as well as with the ♂ lectotype.

[*Tachina exsecta* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

***Tachina fissa*** Walker, 1853 : 51 (No. 72). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement, in which *fissa* was not grouped with other species.

***Tachina flexa*** Walker, 1853 : 58 (No. 89). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which *flexa* was not grouped with other species. Verrall (1888 : 21) listed *flexa* in the genus *Exorista* Meigen, but later (Verrall, 1901 : 43) listed the name in its original combination, as did Bezzi (1907 : 351). Verrall's sense of *Exorista* included species that would now be placed in many genera in different tribes, and there is no evidence that *flexa* belonged to *Exorista* Meigen in its true sense. *T. flexa* was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina immissa*** Walker, 1853 : 53 (No. 77). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The holotype is mouldy and has lost the left hind leg, the right mid leg and parts of the remaining tarsi. It bears a label reading '*T. Immissa*. Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting.

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Lydella grisescens*** Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 112 type(s) [? sex], FRANCE (lost). Verrall (1888 : 21) wrongly placed *immissa* in the genus *Masicera* Macquart, and this was doubtless the basis for Bezzi's (1907 : 283) inclusion of the name in his list of *Masicera* 'Species dubiae'.

***Tachina infensans*** Walker, 1853 : 88 (No. 157). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in very good condition except for loss of the left mid leg and some distortion of the lower head and ptilinum. It bears a printed label '156 infensans Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Pales pavida*** (Meigen, 1824 : 398 (*Tachina*)). Syntype ♂, GERMANY (MNH, Paris) [examined by Herting].

Meigen described *pavida* from both sexes but only a single type-specimen (a male) exists in Meigen's collection in Paris. At present this specimen has the status of syntype.

***Tachina infestans*** Walker, 1853 : 91 (No. 163). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 19) key placement.

***Tachina infixa*** Walker, 1853 : 70 (No. 116). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has lost the right mid and hind legs and the apex of the left hind tarsus but is otherwise in good condition (except for slight crushing of the left side of the head).

*Identity.* **Syn. n. of *Zaira cinerea*** (Fallén, 1810 : 268 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♂ holotype of *infixa* and the ♂ lectotype of *cinerea* have been directly compared.

***Tachina inoperta*** Walker, 1853 : 86 (No. 152). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 19) key placement.

***Tachina inquilina*** Walker, 1853 : 87 (No. 154). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 19) key placement. The species was described from Stephens's collection, but no specimen named as *inquilina* could be found in the Stephens material.



***Tachina insedata*** Walker, 1853 : 87 (No. 155). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 19) key placement.

***Tachina insuscepta*** Walker, 1853 : 50 (No. 70). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The holotype is in bad condition, being very mouldy and having lost the antennae, both fore legs, and the apices of the right mid and hind legs.

*Identity.* *Syn. n.* of ***Exorista larvarum*** (Linnaeus, 1758 : 596 (*Musca*)) sensu authors. Verrall (1888 : 21) wrongly placed *insuscepta* in the genus *Phorocera* Robineau-Desvoidy, and this accounts for Bezzi's (1907 : 319) placement of the name in his list of *Phorocera* 'Species dubiae'.

***Tachina intacta*** Walker, 1853 : 43 (No. 55). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement, in which he associated *intacta* with *evidens* Walker (No. 54, type also lost).

***Tachina intaminata*** Walker, 1853 : 48 (No. 65). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description, or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement, in which he associated *intaminata* with ? *cincta* Meigen. The very small size given by Walker (length  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lines) suggests that *intaminata* may not be a Tachinid. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

***Tachina intercedens*** Walker, 1853 : 31 (No. 28). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

[*Tachina intercepta* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

***Tachina interclusa*** Walker, 1853 : 32 (No. 30). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement. The very small size given by Walker (length  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lines) suggests that *interclusa* may not be a Tachinid.

***Tachina interclusa*** Walker, 1853 : 48 (No. 66). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost). Primary homonym of *T. interclusa* Walker (1853 : 32).

Walker (1853 : [298]) published the replacement name *Tachina excluda* (q.v.) for his second use of the name *T. interclusa*. See under *T. excluda*, above, for a note on the identity.

[*Tachina interlapsa* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 299].

[*Tachina interlatens* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 299].

***Tachina intermixta*** Walker, 1853 : 39 (No. 45). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Verrall (1888 : 21) placed *intermixta* as a species of *Exorista* Meigen, listing the name as valid, but later (Verrall, 1901 : 23) treated *intermixta* as a synonym of *notabilis* Meigen, 1824. Bezzi (1907 : 257, 259) repeated the synonymy established by Verrall. Meigen's *notabilis* is considered to be a synonym of *Nemorilla floralis* (Fallén, 1810), a winthemiine Tachinid with hairy eyes, but Walker (1853 : 16) placed *intermixta* (as No. 45) in a section of his key in which the species had bare eyes and associated it with *nana* Walker (No. 46) which is a Rhinophorid. It is impossible to deduce anything reliable from the description as to the true identity of *intermixta*, which was described from Desvignes's collection, and there is no evidence that Verrall saw any type-specimen; these facts, together with the conflict between Walker's 'bare eyes' and the hairy eyes of *notabilis* = *floralis*, make Verrall's synonymy unacceptable and the name *intermixta* must revert to *nomen dubium* status.

***Tachina interna*** Walker, 1853 : 69 (No. 115). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Verrall (1888 : 21) listed *interna* as a species of *Exorista* Meigen, and this was the basis for Bezzi's (1907 : 251) placement of the name in his list of *Exorista* 'Species dubiae'. Verrall's concept of *Exorista* was very different from the modern conception of this genus, and since nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement and there is no evidence that Verrall saw type-specimens the name *interna* must be considered a *nomen dubium*. The species was described from Desvignes's collection.

***Tachina internexa*** Walker, 1853 : 62 (No. 98). Type(s) [? sex], [ENGLAND, presumed, as letter 'E.' omitted from description] (lost).

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Pales pavid***a (Meigen, 1824 : 398 (*Tachina*)), syntype ♂, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting]. The synonymy of *internexa* was first established by Verrall (1901 : 24), who placed the name as a synonym of *Phorocera cilipeda* Rondani, 1859; but *cilipeda* is a synonym of *pavida* Meigen, and Bezzi (1907 : 311, 312) therefore treated *internexa* as a synonym of *pavida*. Although the type-material of *internexa* from Desvignes's collection is lost the synonymy established by Verrall and Bezzi is considered correct; the description contains nothing that would contra-indicate it.

***Tachina intersecta*** Walker, 1853 : 38 (No. 42). LECTOTYPE ♂, by present designation, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Desvignes).

Paralectotype: ♂ ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The lectotype is in very good condition except for the loss of the right fore leg. The paralectotype is in very bad condition and consists only of the head and anterior half of the thorax, the right fore leg and left mid leg and the left wing, and what remains is badly obscured by mould. Lectotype and paralectotype are each labelled '*T. Intersecta* Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Lypha dubia*** (Fallén, 1810 : 284 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♂ lectotypes of *intersecta* and *dubia* have been directly compared. The female of this species was described by Walker (1853) as *T. commissa*, q.v. The spelling *intersceta* in Bezzi (1907 : 283) is an incorrect subsequent spelling.

[*Tachina intersecta* Walker, 1853 (second use of name). Not Tachinidae, see p. 299].

***Tachina intersita*** Walker, 1853 : 72 (No. 121). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).

The holotype is in extremely bad condition and consists only of the head, thorax and base of left wing, all of which are very dirty. It bears a label reading '*T. Intersita*. Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Nemorilla floralis*** (Fallén, 1810 : 287 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. Verrall (1901 : 23) established the synonymy of *intersita* with *notabilis* Meigen, 1824, and Bezzi (1907 : 259) also cited the name in synonymy with *Nemorilla notabilis*. The latter specific name is a synonym of *floralis* Fallén and *intersita* is therefore a junior synonym of *floralis*. The holotype remains of *intersita* have been directly compared with the ♀ paralectotype of *floralis* as well as with the ♂ lectotype.

***Tachina intracta*** Walker, 1853 : 23 (No. 11). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Bezzi (1907 : 212) listed *intracta* as a possible species of *Ernestia* Robineau-Desvoidy, and it seems probable from the description and Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement that the nominal species did belong in Ernestiini. No definite identification is, however, possible. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

***Tachina involuta*** Walker, 1853 : 53 (No. 78). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 17) key placement, in which he associated *involuta* with *inmissa* (= *Lydella grisescens*) and *erogata* (identity unknown).

***Tachina medoacus*** Walker, 1849 : 746. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has lost the left fore leg and both third antennal segments, but is otherwise in fair condition except for rubbing off of the frontal and dorsal thoracic setae. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Exorista (Adenia) rustica*** (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *medoacus* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed.

***Tachina megaleas*** Walker, 1849 : 739. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of the right fore leg, the left fore tarsus and the apex of the left mid tarsus, and slight damage to the scutum. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Exorista (Adenia) rustica*** (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN NR, (Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *megaleas* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after direct comparison of the ♂ primary types and examination of the genitalia.

***Tachina menestho*** Walker, 1849 : 783. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is a greasy teneral specimen, and has lost the left mid leg, the left hind tibia and tarsus, the right antenna and the left arista, but the bristling is mostly still in place. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Phorocera obscura*** (Fallén, 1810 : 283 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂ (by designation of van Emden, 1954 : 73, footnote), SWEDEN (ÜZI, Lund) [examined by van Emden]. It may usefully be noted here that the paralectotypes of *Phorocera assimilis* (Fallén) are actually specimens of *P. obscura* (Fallén) and that the holotype of *menestho* has been directly compared with them.

[*Tachina mera* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 299].

***Tachina mesula*** Walker, 1849 : 737. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in fairly good condition, but has lost the fore tarsi, the right mid tarsus and the antennae, and the wings are slightly frayed. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Demoticus plebejus*** (Fallén, 1810 : 269 (*Tachina plebeja*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *mesula* with *plebejus* was first established by Austen (1907 : 328) and is here confirmed after direct comparison of the ♂ primary types.

***Tachina motor*** Walker, 1853 : 71 (No. 118). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype is in excellent condition except that the mesonotum is crushed in. It bears a printed label '117 motor Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Lydina aenea*** (Meigen, 1824 : 273 (*Tachina*)), syntype ♀, ? FRANCE or GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

Meigen described *aenea* from both sexes and from specimens collected by himself (presumably in Germany) and by Baumhauer in Provence. The single ♀ specimen in Meigen's collection in Paris has syntype status at present; it is probably from Germany but this is not known positively.

***Tachina multans*** Walker, 1853 : 82 (No. 143). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 18) key placement, in which he associated



*multans* with *Phorocera assimilis* (Fallén) (No. 144) and with *munita* (No. 145) (which also = *assimilis*, see next entry).

***Tachina munita*** Walker, 1853 : 82 (No. 145). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of the left mid leg and apex of the right mid tarsus, and for crushing of the eyes. It bears a printed label '144 munita Walk.'.

**Identity.** **Syn. n.** of *Phorocera assimilis* (Fallén, 1810 : 283 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♂ holotype of *munita* and the ♂ lectotype of *assimilis* have been directly compared.

[*Tachina nana* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 300].

***Tachina neglecta*** Walker, 1853 : 25 (No. 15). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement, though it appears probable that *neglecta* was an *Ernestiine*; Bezzi (1907 : 213) listed it as a possible *Ernestia* species.

***Tachina neglecta*** Walker, 1853 : 79 (No. 138). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker). Primary homonym of *T. neglecta* Walker (1853 : 25), see *T. collecta* Walker (replacement name).

The holotype has lost both fore legs and the right mid leg but is otherwise in good condition except for loss of some scutellar and abdominal setae. It bears a printed label '137 neglecta Walk.'.

**Identity.** See entry for *Tachina collecta*. *T. neglecta* (2) enters into new synonymy with *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén).

[*Tachina nexa* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 300].

***Tachina nigrolineata*** Walker, 1853 : 85 (No. 150) (validation of *T. nigrolineata* Stephens, 1829a, b, *nomen nudum*). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype has lost all the legs except the right hind leg (of which the tarsal apex is missing) and has the lower part of the head distorted and the upper ptilinum extruded, but is otherwise in good condition; the bristling of head, thorax and abdomen is all excellently preserved. It bears a printed label 'nigrolineata mihi'.

**Identity.** Valid senior synonym for *Pseudoperichaeta insidiosa* (Robineau-Desvoidy), new combination ***Pseudoperichaeta nigrolineata*** (Walker) **comb. n.** here established. *P. insidiosa* (Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 : 338 (*Phryxe*)), holotype ♀, FRANCE (MNHN, Paris), here established as a junior synonym (**Syn. n.**) of *P. nigrolineata* (Walker, 1853).

Bezzi (1907 : 337) placed *nigrolineata* as a synonym of *Tachina* (now *Exorista*) *larvarum* (L.), an inexplicably erroneous placement.

***Tachina nymphidius*** Walker, 1849 : 751. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in very good condition except for loss of the left fore tarsus, most of the right tarsi and both aristaе. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

**Identity.** Junior synonym of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *nymphidius* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after comparison of types.

***Tachina objecta*** Walker, 1853 : 78 (No. 134). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 18) key placement. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

***Tachina olizon*** Walker, 1849 : 753. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of the right hind leg and some rubbing of the frontal, mesonotal and abdominal vestiture. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Macquartia praefica* (Meigen, 1824 : 271 (*Tachina*)), holotype or syntype ♀, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

Meigen described only the female of *praefica* but his collection in Paris contains a male and a female specimen. As Meigen (unlike Walker!) was good at sexing Tachinidae it is possible that the male specimen is not an original syntype. The exact type-status of the two specimens is not considered further at present.

***Tachina orbilius*** Walker, 1849 : 736. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has lost both mid legs, the right hind leg, most of the left hind tarsus and the left third antennal segment, but apart from some fraying of the wings is otherwise in good condition. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Macquartia viridana* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 : 1104, syntypes ♂ ♀, FRANCE (lost) = *Macquartia flavipes* sensu authors, not Meigen, 1824 (misidentification). Austen (1907 : 328) synonymized *orbilius* with *flavipes*, but it is now considered that *flavipes* sensu Austen and other authors (such as van Emden, 1954 : 37) is a misidentification. Bezzi (1907 : 209) wrongly placed *orbilius* as a possible synonym of *Micropalpus vulpinus* (Fallén).

***Tachina pamesos*** Walker, 1849 : 744. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in very good condition except for loss of the left mid leg, right mid tarsus, and the apices of other tarsi. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *pamesos* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after comparison of types.

***Tachina particeps*** Walker, 1853 : 41 (No. 49). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement.

***Tachina perpingens*** Walker, 1853 : 67 (No. 110). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in very good condition, but the large pin obscures much of the scutum. It bears a printed label '109 perpingens Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Elfia cingulata* (Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 86 (*Actia*)), holotype [? sex], FRANCE (lost).

***Tachina pertinens*** Walker, 1853 : 43 (No. 56). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key, in which the species was grouped alone. The description indicates that the arista was thickened for its whole length and the costal spine strong, but these clues are not sufficiently strong to be sure of the identity. The species was described from Stephens's collection.

[*Tachina pertracta* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 300].

***Tachina philonis*** Walker, 1849 : 751. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in very good condition except for the loss of the right fore leg and some setae of the dorsum.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of

*philonis* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after examination of types.

***Tachina pitho*** Walker, 1849 : 740. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of the fore tibiae and tarsi and some mesonotal setae. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of ***Exorista (Adenia) rustica*** (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *pitho* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after direct comparison of the ♂ primary types and examination of the genitalia.

***Tachina quadricincta*** Walker, 1853 : 84 (No. 148) (validation of *T. quadricincta* Stephens, 1829a, b, *nomen nudum*). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype has lost both fore legs, the left hind leg and the apex of the right mid leg, but is otherwise well preserved; the chaetotaxy is in excellent condition. It bears a printed label 'quadricincta miki'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Phryxe nemea*** (Meigen, 1824 : 340 (*Tachina*)), syntypes 2 ♀, EUROPE [country uncertain] (NM, Vienna) [examined by Herting].

***Tachina reclusa*** Walker, 1853 : 32 (No. 29). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement.

***Tachina resecta*** Walker, 1853 : 50 (No. 71). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 16) key placement.

***Tachina reformata*** Walker, 1853 : 63 (No. 99). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has lost both mid legs, the left hind leg and some scuteller setae, but is otherwise in good condition except for some mould. It bears a printed label '98 reformata Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Lydina aenea*** (Meigen, 1824 : 273 (*Tachina*)), syntype ♀, ? FRANCE or GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting]. See under *T. motor* Walker, above, for a further note on the provenance and status of *aenea* type-material.

***Tachina rejecta*** Walker, 1853 : 79 (No. 137). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in poor condition, having lost the head, both fore legs, the right mid tibia and tarsus and the scutellar setae, and having a hole in the scutum. It bears a printed label '136 rejecta Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of ***Periscepsia spathulata*** (Fallén, 1820 : 7 (*Tachina*)), holotype ♂ [not ♀], SWEDEN (UZI, Lund).

This species has been known in Britain as *Wagneria lentis* (Meigen, 1824) (van Emden, 1954 : 40), but *lentis* is now considered to be a synonym of *spathulata* (see Herting, 1972 : 9). There are no type-specimens of *spathulata* in Fallén's collection in Stockholm, and the holotype is actually now in Zetterstedt's collection at Lund: the type-locality is Abusa, a small village about 13 km east of Lund in Hällestad parish, and the holotype bears Zetterstedt's label 'T. spathulata ♂ Abusa Mus. Fall.' (Zetterstedt correctly gives the sex as ♂, Fallén's statement of ♀ in the original description being in error.). Standing in Zetterstedt's collection with the holotype is a second specimen labelled 'T. Spathulata ♀ a Gyll.' but this is not an original specimen from Fallén's collection and has no type-status.

***Tachina retracta*** Walker, 1853 : 80 (No. 139). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (UM, Oxford, ex coll. Desvignes).



The holotype is in poor condition; the body and wings are very dirty, the thorax and head rather greased, the right fore leg and left fore tarsus are lost and the left arista is lost.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 112, type(s) [? sex], FRANCE (lost). Verrall (1888 : 21) wrongly placed *retracta* in the genus *Masicera* Macquart, and this was doubtless the basis for Bezzi's (1907 : 284) inclusion of the name in his list of *Masicera* 'Species dubiae'.

***Tachina reventa*** Walker, 1853 : 70 (No. 117). Holotype ♀ [not ♂], ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

Walker stated '*Male*.' at the start of the English description and continued 'Frontalia widening much in front' (which suggests a male specimen), but only one specimen stood under the name *reventa* in Walker's collection, and this is female. Walker was notoriously unable to sex Tachinids correctly and despite the discrepancy with the description it is here considered that the existing female specimen must be the holotype; all features in the description other than those alluded to fit the specimen very exactly. It is of interest to note that the citation of a sex in the *reventa* description is the only instance in which Walker mentioned a sex in any of his British Tachinid descriptions.

The holotype is in fair condition; the head is only weakly attached, the mouthparts partially eaten away, both fore legs and the right third antennal segment are lost, and the vibrissae and frontal setae are rubbed off. It bears a printed label '116 *reventa* Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Dufouria chalybeata* (Meigen, 1824 : 271 (*Tachina*)), syntypes 1 ♂, 1 ♀, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

[*Tachina senta* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 300].

[*Tachina separata* Walker, 1853. Not Tachinidae, see p. 300].

***Tachina telestho*** Walker, 1849 : 747. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has the head and thorax greased, the wings frayed, and the mid tarsi lost or damaged, but is otherwise in fairly good condition (apart from a few lost setae). It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén, 1810 : 264 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *telestho* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after examination of types.

***Tachina titormus*** Walker, 1849 : 755. Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of the right hind leg and right third antennal segment and some disarrangement of the setae. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Macquartia dispar* (Fallén, 1820 : 31 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♀, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The ♀ primary types of *titormus* and *dispar* have been directly compared.

***Tachina torta*** Walker, 1853 : 64 (No. 104). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has lost the apical half of the left wing and the left mid leg, but is otherwise in good condition except for a few fungal threads. It bears a printed label '103 *torta* Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Macquartia praeifica* (Meigen, 1824 : 271 (*Tachina*)), holotype or syntype ♀, GERMANY (MNHN, Paris) [examined by Herting].

For a note on the status of the type-specimen of *praeifica* in Meigen's collection in Paris see *T. olizon* Walker, above.

***Tachina tyche*** Walker, 1849 : 738. Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH).

The holotype has lost the left third antennal segment, the apices of the fore tarsi, the right hind tarsus, and some setae but (apart from a break in the basal abdominal tergites) is otherwise in good condition. The genitalia are slide-mounted. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.



*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén, 1810 : 282 (*Tachina*)), lectotype ♂, SWEDEN (NR, Stockholm) [examined and herein designated]. The synonymy of *tyche* with *vulgaris* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed after direct comparison of the ♂ primary types, and examination of the genitalia of *tyche*.

*Tachina viridulans* Walker, 1853 : 29 (No. 23). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium*. Nothing reliable can be deduced from the description or from Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement in which *viridulans* was grouped alone. Bezzi (1907 : 408) listed *viridulans* as a valid species of *Macquartia* Robineau-Desvoidy, which could possibly be correct; however, no evidence has been found from which Bezzi could possibly have known for certain that this placement was correct, and in the absence of reliable evidence the name is here regarded as a *nomen dubium*.

#### WALKER'S NAMES FOR TACHINIDAE OF UNCERTAIN ORIGIN BUT PROBABLY BRITISH

Walker (1849) described many nominal species of Tachinidae that stood in the BMNH collection without locality data. The types of almost all of these still exist, and it is therefore possible to determine the identities even though the exact provenance is unknown. Some of these nominal species are based upon types that are specimens of well known Palaearctic species, and three of these types could be British (since they belong to species that occur in Britain as well as in continental Europe). All three names are junior synonyms, but it is appropriate to record them here because of the possibility that the type-specimens were collected in Britain. The nominal species concerned are as follows.

*Dexia aurinia* Walker, 1849 : 847. Holotype ♀, [PALAEARCTIC REGION, probably BRITAIN] (BMNH, ex coll. Children).

The holotype has lost both hind legs, the left fore leg, the apices of the remaining tarsi and both third antennal segments; otherwise it is in fair condition except for some damage to the mesonotum. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink, and a pencilled label in Austen's writing which reads 'Locality unknown Ex coll. Children. 40.3.30.266.'. Children's collection was comprised mainly of British insects, and a British provenance for *aurinia* is extremely probable.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Dexia vacua* (Fallén, 1816). The synonymy of *aurinia* with *vacua* was first established by Austen (1907 : 343) and is here confirmed.

*Tachina pagasus* Walker, 1849 : 750. Holotype ♀, [PALAEARCTIC REGION, possibly BRITAIN] (BMNH).

The holotype is in fair condition, but the head and thorax are greasy, the left fore leg lost, left mid tarsus and apices of right tarsi lost, and the left arista lost. It bears a circular green-edged label on which Austen has written the name in black ink, and a pencilled label in Austen's writing which reads 'Locality unknown.'.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén, 1810). The synonymy of *pagasus* with *rustica* was first established by Austen (1907 : 338) and is here confirmed.

*Tachina thyamis* Walker, 1849 : 771. Holotype ♂, [PALAEARCTIC REGION, probably BRITAIN] (BMNH, ex coll. Children).

The holotype has lost all legs except the right mid leg, and has lost the vibrissae, some scutal setae, the scutellar setae and some abdominal vestiture. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink, and a pencilled label in Austen's writing which reads 'Locality unknown. Ex coll. Children. 40.4.3.770.'. Children's

collection was comprised mainly of British insects, and a British provenance for *thyamis* is extremely probable. It should be noted that Walker (1849) also described a *Tachina thyamis* on p. 756 of the same work: the two descriptions differ but are very similar, and it seems possible that Walker made two descriptions of the same specimen; no type has been seen for the p. 756 use of the name (though Austen, 1907 : 338, reported seeing a specimen that did not fit the description), and it is not clear whether the p. 756 and p. 771 uses of the name *thyamis* are primary homonyms or whether they are simply different descriptions of the same thing. As *thyamis* p. 771 is a junior synonym anyway it is of no practical consequence in nomenclature whether homonymy exists or not.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Pelatachina tibialis* (Fallén, 1810). The synonymy of *thyamis* (p. 771) with *tibialis* was first established by Austen (1907 : 338) and is here confirmed.

#### STEPHENS'S NAMES IN THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE

Stephens (1829a; 1829b), in his *Systematic Catalogue* and his *Nomenclature* of British insects, published several new names for Tachinidae that had not previously appeared in print. One of these names was proposed for a new genus (viz. *Triarthria* Stephens) and is discussed elsewhere (see p. 295), and the others were specific names that Stephens intended to apply to species considered by him to be valid or that he listed simply as synonyms of other names. The newly proposed names in both *Catalogue* and *Nomenclature* are nearly always appended with the Latin tag '*mihi*', and it had been Stephens's intention to describe the new species for which these names stood in his *Illustrations of British Entomology*: in the event, however, descriptions were never published of any of the Tachinid species for which Stephens proposed the names, nor I believe for any of the Diptera for which Stephens (*op. cit.*) provided '*mihi*' names. Such specific names are *nomina nuda*, although some of them were validated by later authors (for example, some of Stephens's specific names were used by Walker and validated by him with descriptions).

The list that follows includes all the names proposed by Stephens for British Tachinidae (excluding the one generic name), and indicates the status of each name and the serial numbering of the name as given in Stephens (1829b). The identities of the various species to which Stephens intended the names to apply have – with few exceptions – been determined by reference to the specimens standing above the names in Stephens's collection. These specimens have now been removed from Stephens's collection and, after appropriate labelling, have been placed in the British Diptera collection of the BMNH. Each such specimen has been labelled in my handwriting, as in the following example: '*Tachina plumbea*/Stephens nom. nud./ex coll. Stephens/Britain'.

Stephens intended that most of the species for which he proposed the '*mihi*' names should be placed in a new genus distinct from *Tachina* Meigen, but he never actually described this genus. He referred to it in the *Nomenclature* (p. 59) as 'N.G. – (Tachina, p. Fall.)', meaning part of *Tachina* in Fallén's sense, and in the *Catalogue* (p. 298) as 'Genus 150 : (1274).—', meaning the 150th genus of British Diptera (left unnamed). Stephens's specific names listed under the undescribed genus are not, in the literal sense, combined into binomina but they are associated with the generic name *Tachina*; in the list that follows they have therefore been cited in combination with *Tachina*.

A few of Stephens's specific names that he cited in Tachinid genera are known (from specimens in his collection) to apply to species that are no longer considered to be Tachinidae. Such names are listed below in square brackets and are considered further on p. 297.

The serial numbers cited in the reference to each name are those given by Stephens (1829*b*) in the *Catalogue*. The large number cited first is the serial number given by Stephens to the species in the British insects as a whole, and the small number that follows in brackets is Stephens's serial number for that species in its particular genus.

*Dexia albifrons* Stephens, 1829*a* : 59; 1829*b* : 302 (No. 8820 (11)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained three male specimens standing under this name, all of which are *Thelaira nigripes* (Fabricius, 1794); the name *albifrons* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

*Dexia cinerea* Stephens, 1829*a* : 60; 1829*b* : 303 (No. 8823 (14)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection lacks any specimens standing under this name, and the species for which Stephens intended it remains unknown.

[*Leucostoma nervosa*. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

[*Leucostoma venosa* (Stephens, not Meigen). Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

*Musca chrysostoma* Stephens, 1829*b* : 303 (No. 8825 (16)). Unavailable name first published as a synonym.

Stephens published this name as 'Mu. chrysostoma. *Mus. Marsham*' and placed it in synonymy with '*Dexia canina*' (now *Dexiosoma caninum*). Specimens of *Dexiosoma caninum* (Fabricius, 1781) in Stephens's collection are correctly identified, and the unavailable name *chrysostoma* is therefore retained in synonymy with *caninum*.

*Musca longipes* Stephens, 1829*b* : 302 (No. 8822 (13)). Unavailable name first published as a synonym.

Stephens published this name as 'Mu. longipes. *Mus. Marsham*.' and placed it in synonymy with *Dexia rustica* (Fabricius, 1775). Specimens of *Dexia rustica* in Stephens's collection are correctly identified, and the unavailable name *longipes* is therefore retained in synonymy with *rustica*.

[*Musca putris*. Not Tachinidae, see p. 298].

*Tachina apicalis* Stephens, 1829*a* : 59; 1829*b* : 298 (No. 8755 (7)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained one male specimen standing under this name. It is a specimen of *Pales pavida* (Meigen, 1824), and *apicalis* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

*Tachina bimaculata* Stephens, 1829*a* : 59; 1829*b* : 298 (No. 8759 (11)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained one female specimen standing under this name. It is a specimen of *Phryxe nemea* (Meigen, 1824), and *bimaculata* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

*Tachina cognata* Stephens, 1829*a* : 59; 1829*b* : 298 (No. 8752(4)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained one female specimen standing under this name. It is a

specimen of *Epicampocera succincta* (Meigen, 1824), and *cognata* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

*Tachina dubia* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 299 (No. 8779 (31)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained one female specimen standing under this name. It is a specimen of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, and *dubia* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

[*Tachina nana*. Not Tachinidae, see p. 299].

*Tachina nigrolineata* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 299 (No. 8763 (15)). *Nomen nudum*, subsequently validated as *Tachina nigrolineata* Walker, 1853, q.v.

Stephens's collection contained one female specimen standing under this name. This specimen was subsequently described by Walker (1853 : 85) and is the holotype of *T. nigrolineata* Walker. The specific name is valid with Walker's authorship for the single British species of *Pseudoperichaeta* Brauer & Bergenstamm (see p. 288).

*Tachina plumbea* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 298 (No. 8754 (6)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained a male and a female specimen standing under this name. Both are specimens of *Pales pavida* (Meigen, 1824), and *plumbea* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

*Tachina quadricincta* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 299 (No. 8765 (17)). *Nomen nudum*, subsequently validated as *Tachina quadricincta* Walker, 1853, q.v.

Stephens's collection contained one female specimen standing under this name. This specimen was subsequently described by Walker (1853 : 84) and is the holotype of *T. quadricincta* Walker; the name is a junior synonym of *Phryxe nemea* (Meigen, 1824) (see p. 290).

*Tachina testaceipes* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 299 (No. 8767 (19)). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained one male specimen standing under this name. It is a specimen of *Phryno vetula* (Meigen, 1824), and *testaceipes* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species.

#### THE STATUS, IDENTITY AND SYNONYMY OF THE GENERIC NAME *TRIARTHRIA* STEPHENS

Walker did not propose any generic names in the British Tachinidae, but Stephens published one such name, viz. *Triarthria*. This name appeared in the *Nomenclature of British Insects* (Stephens, 1829a : 59) and again in the *Systematic Catalogue of British Insects* (Stephens, 1829b : 300). The name is marked in Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus* (1940, 4 : 533) as a *nomen nudum* because it was not accompanied in either of Stephens's works by a description. However, it is now evident from the *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature* that it is not a *nomen nudum* but is an available name under the provisions of Article 16(a) (v), since Stephens cited three available specific names in combination with *Triarthria*.

The three species included in *Triarthria* were *bicolor* Meigen, 1824, *spinipennis* Meigen, 1824, and *albicollis* Meigen, 1824, all of which were cited by Stephens (1829b) with their correct original references and were rightly identified (the correctness of Stephens's identifications was confirmed during this work by examination of the



specimens still standing under the three names in the Stephens collection). The name *Triarthria* ('three joints') must without doubt allude to the tripartite nature of the arista in the species which Stephens aggregated in the genus, a character which is extremely striking in *spinipennis*.

In current classification the three species that Stephens placed in *Triarthria* belong to different genera: *bicolor* is a species of *Ceromya* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (the specific name applying to the type-species); *spinipennis* is a species of *Bigonicheta* Rondani, 1845; and *albicollis* is a species of *Neaera* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (the specific name applying to the type-species). Since *Triarthria* has been for long unrecognized there has not been any type-designation made for it, but whichever of the three included species just cited is fixed as type-species the name will automatically supplant some other generic name (as *Triarthria*, dating from 1829, has priority over all the other generic names potentially involved).

The European Tachinidae are now under very active study by a number of workers and the systematics is moving gradually from the alpha to the beta stages. At this transitional time many familiar generic names are falling into synonymy as older names are interpreted correctly from detailed study of their types, but there are few if any cases where application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to preserve a junior synonym is really justified. As a firm believer in the over-riding value of the Law of Priority I am therefore bringing *Triarthria* into use and am here designating *Tachina spinipennis* Meigen, 1824, as its type-species. (It should be noted here that Westwood, 1840: 138, mentioned *Triarthria* and *spinipennis* but that his mention cannot be construed as a valid type-fixation.)

The effect of this type-designation is to make *Triarthria* a senior synonym for *Bigonicheta* Rondani, the name hitherto applied (either under this spelling or with several variant alternatives) to a familiar genus of earwig parasites occurring in the Palaearctic Region and (by introduction) in the Nearctic Region. In deciding which of the three included species to designate as type-species I have weighed the arguments that would favour one course over another (any designation involves *Triarthria* superseding some other generic name) and am satisfied that the balance is in favour of designating *spinipennis* and thereby sinking *Bigonicheta*. In order that other workers shall appreciate the reasons why *spinipennis* has been chosen they are here enumerated.

- (1) The 'three-jointed' nature of the arista (with its very elongate first and second segments) is exceedingly conspicuous in this species (more so than in the others).
- (2) Six correctly identified specimens of *spinipennis* stood in the Stephens collection, as compared to only one each of others.
- (3) Westwood knew of Stephens's genus and mentioned only *spinipennis* in relation to it.
- (4) Designation of *spinipennis* changes a generic name for the Holarctic area only (whereas designation of *bicolor* would change a name currently in use in all the major Old World regions).

- (5) It eliminates at last the long-persistent muddle that has bedevilled the literature because of emendations and erroneous spellings of *Bigonicheta*.  
 (6) Dr B. Herting, specialist on western European Tachinidae, informs me (personal communication) that he too, in the circumstances, is inclined to the fixation of *spinipennis*.

The synonymy of *Triarthria* is now as set out below. In the synonymy confirmed nomenclatorial synonyms are given first, followed by a doubtful synonym and incorrect subsequent spellings (the last in alphabetical order). (The variant spellings of *Bigonicheta* have been investigated with special attention to those cited in Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus*: all of the usages traced are considered to have the status of incorrect subsequent spellings under the *Code* and not to be emendations, since they are not *demonstrably* intentional.)

### **TRIARTHRIA** Stephens, 1829

*Triarthria* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 300. Type-species: *Tachina spinipennis* Meigen, 1824, by PRESENT DESIGNATION. **BRITAIN.**

*Bigonicheta* Rondani, 1845 : 32, 34. Type-species: *Bigonicheta mariettii* Rondani, 1845 [= *Tachina setipennis* Fallén, 1810], by monotypy. **ITALY. Syn. n.**

*Dira* Gistel, 1848 : xi. Unnecessary replacement name for *Triarthria* Stephens (cited as *Triarthra*, attributed to Meigen in error), preoccupied by *Dira* Hübner, 1819.

*Ramburia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1851 : 189. Type-species: *Tachina setipennis* Fallén, 1810, by monotypy. **SWEDEN. Syn. n.**

*Trichonevra* Lioy, 1864 : 1341. Type-species: *Tachina spinipennis* Meigen, 1824, by monotypy. **GERMANY. Syn. n.** [Objective synonym of *Triarthria*.]

? *Osmaea* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 84. Type-species: *Osmaea grisea* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, by monotypy. **FRANCE.**

*Bigonichaeta*. Incorrect subsequent spelling of *Bigonicheta* Rondani.

*Bigonochaeta*. Incorrect subsequent spelling of *Bigonicheta* Rondani.

*Digonichaeta*. Incorrect subsequent spelling of *Bigonicheta* Rondani.

*Digonicheta*. Incorrect subsequent spelling of *Bigonicheta* Rondani.,

*Digonochaeta*. Incorrect subsequent spelling of *Bigonicheta* Rondani.

As the result of the above new synonymy of *Bigonicheta* the following two new combinations are here established:

*Triarthria setipennis* (Fallén, 1810) **comb. n.**

*Triarthria spinipennis* (Meigen, 1824) **comb. n.**

### NAMES OF WALKER AND STEPHENS PURPORTEDLY FOR THE BRITISH TACHINIDAE BUT APPLYING IN OTHER FAMILIES

Walker (1853) described several nominal species in the genus *Tachina* Meigen that are known, or believed without doubt, not to be Tachinidae, the names applying to species of Sarcophagidae or Rhinophoridae. Stephens (1829a; 1829b) published a few names that are *nomina nuda* and purportedly applied to British Tachinidae, but that are now known (from specimens in the Stephens collection) to apply to

Rhinophoridae. As all the names had to be investigated for the present work it has been thought useful to enumerate them here and to clarify their status, even though they are not strictly relevant to the Tachinidae. The names are listed alphabetically under their original binomina.

*Leucostoma nervosa* Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 300 (No. 8790 (9), as *venosa* by lapsus). *Nomen nudum*, without later validation.

Stephens's collection contained two male specimens standing under this name (*nervosa*), both of which are *Melanomya nana* (Meigen, 1826); the name *nervosa* Stephens is placeable in the synonymy of this species of Rhinophoridae.

*Musca putris* Stephens, 1829b : 302 (No. 8813 (4)). Unavailable name first published as a synonym.

Stephens published this name as 'Mu. putris. *Mus. Marsham*' and placed it in synonymy with '*Dexia melania*', but Stephens misidentified *melania*. The true *melania* Meigen, 1824, is a Tachinid belonging in the genus *Medina* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (see Herting, 1972 : 10) and does not occur in the British fauna, but the specimens (2 ♂, 1 ♀) from Stephens's collection named as *melania* are actually specimens of *Stevenia atramentaria* (Meigen, 1824); the name *putris* Stephens is therefore placeable in the synonymy of this species of Rhinophoridae.

*Tachina caminaria* Walker, 1853 : 35 (No. 36). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype has lost both hind legs and the left mid leg but is otherwise in very good condition. It bears a printed label 'caminaria,' from Stephens's collection.

*Identity.* *Syn. n.* of *Stevenia atramentaria* (Meigen, 1824) [Rhinophoridae]. Verrall (1888 pt. 2 : 4) listed *caminaria* as possibly a species of *Leucostoma* Meigen, and Bezzi (1907 : 328) wrongly placed it – under the neuter spelling *caminarium* – as a synonym of *Leucostoma simplex* (Fallén).

*Tachina contempta* Walker, 1853 : 77 (No. 133). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in very good condition except for the loss of the right third antennal segment, the vibrissae and some frontal setae. It bears a printed label '132 contempta Walk.'.

*Identity.* *Syn. n.* of *Sarcophaga nigriventris* Meigen, 1826 [Sarcophagidae].

*Tachina expetita* Walker, 1853 : 36 (No. 38). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium* but almost certainly applied in the Rhinophoridae and not in Tachinidae. This is suggested by the description, Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement, and the fact that he closely associated it with *caminaria* (= *atramentaria*) and *atramentaria*. It is therefore here regarded as a *nomen dubium* in Rhinophoridae.

*Tachina exsecta* Walker, 1853 : [298]. Replacement name for *Tachina intersecta* Walker, 1853 : 76, primary homonym of *Tachina intersecta* Walker, 1853 : 38.

Walker (1853) described two different species with the name *Tachina intersecta*, but published the replacement name *T. exsecta* for the second use of the name *intersecta* in a table of 'Errata' on an unnumbered page immediately following the last numbered page of the work (p. 297). Type-information for *T. exsecta* is given under *T. intersecta* below, q.v.

*Identity.* *Syn. n.* of *Sarcophaga nigriventris* Meigen, 1826 [Sarcophagidae]. Bezzi (1907 : 319) placed *exsecta* in a list of *Phorocera* 'Species dubiae'.

*Tachina intercepta* Walker, 1853 : 34 (No. 33). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Phyto melanocephala* (Meigen, 1824) [Rhinophoridae]. The synonymy of *intercepta* with *melanocephala* was first established by Bezzi (1907 : 462).



I have been unable to discover what evidence Bezzi had for this synonymy, which does not appear to have been given anywhere by Verrall (upon whose lists Bezzi mainly depended for information on Walker's names); however, the description of *intercepta*, for what it is worth, does not noticeably conflict with the characters of *Phyto melanocephala* and I therefore maintain the synonymy as correct.

***Tachina interlapsa*** Walker, 1853 : 37 (No. 41). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** **Syn. n. of *Melanophora roralis*** (Linnaeus, 1758) [Rhinophoridae]. Bezzi (1907 : 457) cited *interlapsa* as a synonym of *Stevenia atramentaria* (Meigen) [Rhinophoridae], but I am convinced that this synonymy – which must have been made by guesswork since Verrall had not suggested such a placement in his lists – is wrong. *S. atramentaria* is one of the largest British Rhinophorids, and Walker's description gave the length of *interlapsa* as only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  lines, this alone contra-indicating *Stevenia*. However there is really no doubt from description and key placement (Walker, 1853 : 16) that *interlapsa* was a Rhinophorid, and it seems certain that it was the same as *Melanophora roralis*. Walker's description picks out just those features of the wing colour and venation, shining black non-pollinose body and subcylindrical abdomen that exactly fit *roralis* (together with the small size). Walker's Latin description reads 'Nigra, gracilis, alis alulisque nigris, venis cubitali et praebachiali conjunctis, abdomine subcylindrico. Long  $1\frac{1}{2}$ ; alar. 3 lin.', and the English description elaborates details of the conformation of the wing veins perfectly as in *roralis*; the petiole is very long ('praebachial vein . . . joining the cubital at about four-fifths of the length of the latter'), cross-vein *m-cu* is very remote from the end of vein *Cu*<sub>1</sub> ('discal transverse vein [i.e. *m-cu*] straight, obliquely parted from the hind border by about thrice its own length from the border [of the wing]', and *m-cu* joins vein *M* unusually far from the bend ('flexure') of *M* ('discal transverse vein . . . more than twice its length from the flexure of the praebachial'). These characteristics taken in conjunction with the small size cited, the polished black colour and 'wings blackish', justify the positive conclusion that *interlapsa* is a junior synonym of *roralis* (**syn. n.**).

***Tachina interlatens*** Walker, 1853 : 35 (No. 37). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

**Identity.** Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium* but almost certainly applied in the Rhinophoridae and not in Tachinidae. The description and Walker's (1853 : 15) key placement appear to indicate a Rhinophorid with petiolate cell *R*<sub>5</sub>, and it is possible that *interlatens* was the same as *Rhinophora lepida* (Meigen). Definite synonymy is not justified, and the name is here regarded as a *nomen dubium* in Rhinophoridae.

***Tachina intersecta*** Walker, 1853 : 76 (No. 130). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Desvignes). Primary homonym of *T. intersecta* Walker (1853 : 38), see *T. exsecta* Walker (replacement name).

The holotype has lost the left mid leg, right hind leg, the apex of the left wing and a few setae but is otherwise in good condition; the genitalia are separately mounted on a card. It bears a label reading 'T. Intersecta. Walker's original type from Desvignes' collection' in an unrecognized handwriting, and a rectangular red-bordered label reading 'HOLOTYPE ♂ *Tachina intersecta* Walker 1853, Ins. Brit. Dipt., 2 : 76' in Pont's writing.

**Identity.** See entry for *Tachina exsecta*. *T. intersecta* (2) enters into new synonymy with *Sarcophaga nigriventris* Meigen, 1826 [Sarcophagidae].

***Tachina mera*** Walker, 1853 : 65 (No. 106). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype has the right eye crushed, the right leg missing and some fungal threads but is otherwise in good condition. It bears a printed label '105 mera Walk.'.

**Identity.** **Syn. n. of *Melanomyia nana*** (Meigen, 1826) [Rhinophoridae].

***Tachina nana*** Stephens, 1829a : 59; 1829b : 299 (No. 8780 (32)). *Nomen nudum*, subsequently validated as *Tachina nana* Walker, 1853, q.v. below.

Stephen's collection contained one male specimen standing under this name. This specimen was subsequently described by Walker (1853 : 39) and is the holotype of *T. nana* Walker; the name is a junior synonym of *Rhinophora lepida* (Meigen, 1824).

***Tachina nana*** Walker, 1853 : 39 (No. 46) (validation of *T. nana* Stephens, 1829a, b, *nomen nudum*). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Stephens).

The holotype is in good condition except for loss of both mid legs, the left fore tarsus and the tip of the left hind tarsus. It bears a printed label from the Stephens collection reading 'nana mihi'.

*Identity.* **Syn n.** of *Rhinophora lepida* (Meigen, 1824) [Rhinophoridae].

***Tachina nexa*** Walker, 1853 : 63 (No. 101). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is slightly mouldy and has lost the right hind leg and the apices of the left tarsi but is otherwise in good condition. It bears a printed label '100 nexa Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Phyto melanocephala* (Meigen, 1824) [Rhinophoridae].

***Tachina pertracta*** Walker, 1853 : 45 (No. 60). Type(s) [? sex], ENGLAND (lost).

*Identity.* Unknown, the name remains a *nomen dubium* in the Sarcophagidae. From the description, which refers to the arista being plumose on the basal half and the mesonotum being trivittate (as in *Sarcophaga* s.l. and other Sarcophagidae) it appears quite certain that *pertracta* was a Sarcophagid.

***Tachina senta*** Walker, 1853 : 68 (No. 113). Holotype ♂, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Walker).

The holotype is in good condition except that the ptilinum is partially extruded, the left fore leg lost, the apices of the mid tarsi lost, and the abdomen slightly dirty. It bears a printed label '112 senta Walk.'.

*Identity.* **Syn. n.** of *Brachicoma devia* (Fallén, 1820) [Sarcophagidae].

***Tachina separata*** Walker, 1853 : 67 (No. 111). Holotype ♀, ENGLAND (BMNH, ex coll. Saunders). Junior primary homonym of *Tachina separata* Meigen, 1824.

The holotype has lost the head and abdomen but the remainder is in very good condition except for loss of the tips of the right fore and mid tarsi. It bears a circular green-edged type label on which Austen has written the name in black ink.

*Identity.* Junior synonym of *Brachicoma devia* (Fallén, 1820) [Sarcophagidae]. The synonymy of *separata* with *devia* was first established by Austen (1907 : 329) and is here confirmed. Presumably the head and abdomen were present on the type when it was examined by Austen, as he did not comment on them. Although *T. separata* Walker is a junior primary homonym of *T. separata* Meigen no new name is required (being obviated by the synonymy of the former with *devia*).

#### LECTOTYPE DESIGNATIONS FOR SOME NOMINAL SPECIES DESCRIBED BY FALLÉN

In order reliably to determine the identities of several of Walker's nominal species it has been necessary to compare the types with those of some nominal species described by Fallén. Most of Fallén's Tachinidae are at present based on syntypic type-series, no lectotypes having yet been designated for most of the nominal species. Some of these type-series are mixed and lectotype designations are therefore desirable. Lectotypes are here designated for ten of Fallén's nominal species, all of which are currently considered valid. In the instances of mixed series the lectotype designations here made maintain existing usage.

It appears to have been Fallén's practice to attach a name label to only one of his specimens, or occasionally to one of each sex, and not to attach any locality data. Consequently most specimens standing in the Fallén collection at Stockholm have no labels at all and their identity is determined by the place labels in the collection. All specimens standing against a particular name have been accepted

as original syntypes unless there is contrary evidence; in some instances only the male sex was originally described and female specimens are therefore excluded from the type-series, and in other instances there are special clues (such as labels linking specimens to literature that post-dates the description) that contra-indicate syntype status.

The ten nominal species for which lectotypes are here designated were all described in *Tachina* Meigen and are listed alphabetically. The paralectotypes that are correctly associated with the lectotypes are differentiated from the misassociated paralectotypes and the actual identities of the latter are cited. As there are no locality data on the specimens the type-locality information has all been derived from the literature. Some original specimens of the species cited stand in the Zetterstedt collection at the Zoological Institute, Lund; these have not been seen as they have no nomenclatorial significance now that the lectotypes in the main Fallén collection at Stockholm are designated. All syntypes seen have been appropriately labelled to show their status and their currently correct binomina.

***Tachina assimilis*** Fallén, 1810 : 283. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN [no other locality data] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (misassociated): 8 ♂, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype has lost the left mid and hind legs and has a large hole in the left side of the thorax and abdominal base but is otherwise in good condition. It bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'T. assimilis ♂'.

Fallén originally described only the male, but later (Fallén, 1820 : 28) described both sexes. Three females stand in the Fallén collection under the name *assimilis* but are excluded from the syntype series as the female was not an originally described sex. All eight males standing under *assimilis* are accepted as original specimens (paralectotypes) as there is no contrary evidence; one has a Fallén label reading 'Tachina assimilis ♂ Fallén' and another has a faded ink number '33'.

The specimen designated as lectotype belongs to a different species from all the other specimens, but its designation is essential in order to preserve the past meaning of *assimilis*. This species is the type-species of *Phorocera* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, and the designation of lectotype here made ensures that the name *assimilis* continues to apply to the same species as in the past. All the paralectotypes, and two of the three females that lack type-status, belong to another species that Fallén also described, viz. *Phorocera obscura* (Fallén, 1810 : 283) (lectotype ♂ designated by van Emden and in Lund) and have been labelled accordingly. The third female specimen is true *assimilis*, conspecific with the lectotype.

***Tachina cinerea*** Fallén, 1810 : 268. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN: Skåne, Äsperöd [= Esperöd] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotype (misassociated): 1 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype is in excellent condition. It bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'Tachina cinerea ♂ Fall.'.

The ♀ paralectotype is a specimen of *Meigenia* Robineau-Desvoidy; it bears Fallén's label reading 'T. cinerea ♀ var. palp. nig.' and an identification label of Dr D. M. Wood naming it as *Meigenia* sp.

In the original description Fallén cited *cinerea* as met with on arable lands without specifying a locality, but he later (Fallén, 1820 : 20) cited the locality as 'Esperöd'. This is the place where Fallén had his manorial estate (some 20 km north of the town of Simrishamn on the south-east coast of Skåne), on which he collected many of his insects (Persson, personal communication).

There are no syntypes of this species standing in the Zetterstedt collection.



***Tachina dispar*** Fallén, 1820 : 31 (No. 64). LECTOTYPE ♀, SWEDEN [no other locality data] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotype (misassociated): 1 ♂, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype is in excellent condition except for a small tear on the costal region of the right wing. It bears Fallén's ink label reading 'Tachina dispar ♂ ♀ an Musca dubitata dist?'.

The ♂ specimen in the Fallén collection at Stockholm is regarded as a syntype, although it was referred to at the end of the original description as 'Var. β.'. It is not conspecific with the ♀ lectotype (belonging to another, unidentified, species of *Macquartia*) and bears Fallén's label 'var. seta ant. pubescente', together with a Zetterstedt label reading 'T. egens ♂ Meig.'. The ♀ is designated as lectotype to conform with the species that has long been known as *Macquartia dispar* (Fallén).

The Zetterstedt collection in Lund contains two original specimens of *dispar* from 'Mus Fall.' (i.e. Fallén collection) that are evidently syntypes (paralectotypes) and are on the same pin; they have not been seen.

***Tachina dubia*** Fallén, 1810 : 284. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN: Skåne, Äsperöd [= Esperöd] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotype (correctly associated): 1 ♂, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype has lost the right legs, the left mid leg, most of the left hind tarsus and the right third antennal segment, but is otherwise in good condition. It is on a rather slender pin and bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'T. dubia ♂ Fallén.'. The paralectotype has a faded ink label reading '28'.

Standing with the lectotype and paralectotype in Stockholm are two correctly associated female specimens, one of which has Fallén's label 'T. dubia ♀ Fall.'. These females are deemed to have no type-status, as only the male was originally described; Fallén (1820 : 29) described the female subsequently.

***Tachina floralis*** Fallén, 1810 : 287. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN [no other locality data] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (correctly associated): 2 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (misassociated): 2 ♂, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype has lost both fore legs and both mid legs, but is otherwise in good condition except for a few missing setae. It bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'Tachina floralis ♂ Fallén.'. One of the ♀ paralectotypes bears Fallén's label 'Tach. floralis ♀ Fall.' and is in fair condition; the other is unlabelled and lacks the head.

One of the misassociated ♂ paralectotypes, and possibly both, belong to Fallén's 'Var. β', as one bears an original Fallén label reading 'T. floralis β Fallén.'. Both misassociated males are specimens of *Meigenia* Robineau-Desvoidy, and the one with Fallén's label bears Dr D. M. Wood's determination label as *Meigenia mutabilis* (Fallén).

Two paralectotypes (not seen) are in the Zetterstedt collection at Lund.

***Tachina nigrita*** Fallén 1810 : 286. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN: Skåne, Äsperöd [= Esperöd] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (correctly associated): 2 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype is in excellent condition except for loss of the left fore leg and a tear in the right wing. It bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'T. nigrita ♂ Fall.'. One of the ♀ paralectotypes bears Fallén's label 'T. nigrita ♀ Fall' and the other (which lacks the abdomen) has a faded ink label apparently reading '55'.

There are no syntypes of this species in the Zetterstedt collection.

The type-locality was not cited in the original description but was given later by Fallén (1820 : 35) as Esperöd.

***Tachina pilipennis*** Fallén, 1810 : 273 (as *piliipfnis* by typographical error). LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN: Skåne, ? Äsperöd [= Esperöd] (NR, Stockholm).



Paralectotypes (correctly associated): 3 ♂, 3 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype is in good condition except for loss of the left mid leg and a little mould. It bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'Tachina pilipennis ♂ Fallén'. One of the ♀ paralectotypes bears Fallén's label reading 'T. pilipennis ♀ Fallén.' and one of the ♂ paralectotypes has a label in black ink in Zetterstedt's hand reading 'T. crassicornis. Meig. pilipennis Fall ♂.'; another ♂ paralectotype has a label with a '♂' sex sign, probably attached by Zetterstedt.

The type-locality was not specified by Fallén, but Zetterstedt (1844 : 1045) mentions 'Esperöd' as one locality, and this may well be the true type-locality.

One specimen (not seen) is in the Zetterstedt collection at Lund and may be another paralectotype.

***Tachina plebeja*** Fallén, 1810 : 269. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN [no other locality data] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (correctly associated): 1 ♂, 5 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype has the third antennal segments partially eaten out and has lost the aristas but is otherwise in excellent condition. It bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'Tachina plebeja ♂ Fallén'. One of the ♀ paralectotypes has Fallén's label 'Tachina plebeja ♀ Fallén.', and all other paralectotypes are unlabelled.

Standing with the original syntypes is one ♀ specimen bearing a faded ink label reading 'Bohemann'. This label almost certainly ties this specimen to Fallén's (1820 : 13) record of a specimen collected by Boheman in 'Smolandia' (= Småland), and indicates that it cannot be an original syntype. It has no type-status.

One original specimen (paralectotype, not seen) is in Zetterstedt's collection in Lund.

***Tachina rustica*** Fallén, 1810 : 264. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN: Skåne, Asperöd [= Esperöd] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (correctly associated): 5 ♂, 3 ♀, data presumed as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (misassociated): 4 ♂, 1 ♀, data presumed as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype is in perfect condition and is unlabelled. A headless ♂ paralectotype bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'Tachina rustica ♂ Fallén' and a ♀ paralectotype bears Fallén's label 'Tachina rustica ♀ Fall.'; the other paralectotypes are unlabelled and one has the ♂ genitalia extracted and card-mounted.

The misassociated paralectotypes belong to two species: two males are specimens of *Exorista (Adenia) mimula* (Meigen) (one with genitalia extracted and card-mounted), and two males and a female are specimens of *Exorista (Adenia) tubulosa* Herting; of the latter the female and one of the males are mounted on the same pin and this male has the genitalia extracted and card-mounted.

Two specimens (not seen) in the Zetterstedt collection at Lund, standing under the name *Tachina larvarum* L., bear original Fallén labels and are probably syntypes (paralectotypes).

***Tachina vulgaris*** Fallén, 1810 : 282. LECTOTYPE ♂, SWEDEN [no other locality data] (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes: (correctly associated): 5 ♂, 5 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

Paralectotypes (misassociated): 3 ♂, 1 ♀, data as lectotype (NR, Stockholm).

The lectotype is in perfect condition and is unlabelled. A ♂ paralectotype bears Fallén's faded ink label reading 'Tachina vulgaris ♀ [sic] Fallén.', one of the ♀ paralectotypes has a Fallén label reading 'Tachina vulgaris ♀ Fallén' and another ♀ has a label reading 'T. vulgaris ♀' (probably in Fallén's hand). One of the unlabelled correctly associated ♂ paralectotypes has the genitalia extracted and card-mounted.

The misassociated paralectotypes belong to three species. One ♂ bears a Fallén label reading 'Tachina vulgaris ♂ Fallén' and is a specimen of *Aplomya confinis* (Fallén); it bears a 1969 determination label of Dr D. M. Wood with the name 'confinis.'. Two unlabelled

males are specimens of *Thelymyia saltuum* (Meigen), and the unlabelled ♀ is a specimen of *Blondelia nigripes* (Fallén).

One original specimen (not seen) labelled by Fallén is in the Zetterstedt collection in Lund.

#### SUMMARY OF NEW SYNONYMS AND NEW COMBINATIONS

The nomenclatural changes established in this paper are summarized below in their appropriate categories. The order is alphabetical and in the synonymies the invalid junior names are cited first. The family is indicated for names that do not apply in the Tachinidae.

##### New synonymy in generic names

*Bigonicheta* Rondani, **syn. n.** of *Triarthria* Stephens.

*Ramburia* Robineau-Desvoidy, **syn. n.** of *Triarthria* Stephens.

*Trichonevra* Lioy, **syn. n.** of *Triarthria* Stephens.

##### New synonymy in specific names

*Chetina setigena* Rondani, **syn. n.** of *Chetina ambivius* (Walker).

*Phryxe insidiosa* Robineau-Desvoidy, **syn. n.** of *Pseudoperichaeta nigrolineata* (Walker).

*Tachina accidens* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phyllomya volvulus* (Fabricius).

*Tachina amphiro* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phryxe heraclei* (Meigen).

*Tachina caminaria* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Stevenia atramentaria* (Meigen) [Rhinophoridae].

*Tachina certans* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Timavia amoena* (Meigen).

*Tachina clymene* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Zophomyia temula* (Scopoli).

*Tachina collecta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén).

*Tachina commissa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lypha dubia* (Fallén).

*Tachina comosa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lypha dubia* (Fallén).

*Tachina computa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Campogaster exigua* (Meigen).

*Tachina constans* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén).

*Tachina contempta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Sarcophaga nigriventris* (Meigen) [Sarcophagidae].

*Tachina crisia* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Eurithia anthophila* (Robineau-Desvoidy).

*Tachina defecta* Walker (1), **syn. n.** of *Billaea irrorata* (Meigen).

*Tachina delitescens* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Timavia amoena* (Meigen).

*Tachina demota* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy.

*Tachina denotans* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Dinera grisescens* (Fallén).

*Tachina diniele* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Pales pumicata* (Meigen).

*Tachina discrepans* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy.

*Tachina disterrmina* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén).

*Tachina excessa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Dufouria nigrata* (Fallén).

*Tachina excensa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Actia pilipennis* (Fallén).

*Tachina exsecta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Sarcophaga nigriventris* (Meigen) [Sarcophagidae].

*Tachina immissa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy.

*Tachina infensans* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Pales pavida* (Meigen).

*Tachina infixa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Zaira cinerea* (Fallén).

*Tachina insuscepta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Exorista larvarum* (Linnaeus).

*Tachina interlapsa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Melanophora rovalis* (Linnaeus) [Rhinophoridae].

*Tachina intersecta* Walker (1), **syn. n.** of *Lypha dubia* (Fallén).

- Tachina intersecta* Walker (2), **syn. n.** of *Sarcophaga nigriventris* (Meigen) [Sarcophagidae].  
*Tachina menestho* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phorocera obscura* (Fallén).  
*Tachina mera* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Melanomyia nana* (Meigen) [Rhinophoridae].  
*Tachina motor* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lydina aenea* (Meigen).  
*Tachina munita* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phorocera assimilis* (Fallén).  
*Tachina nana* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Rhinophora lepida* (Meigen) [Rhinophoridae].  
*Tachina neglecta* Walker (2), **syn. n.** of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén).  
*Tachina nexa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phyto melanocephala* (Meigen) [Rhinophoridae].  
*Tachina olizon* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Macquartia praefica* (Meigen).  
*Tachina orbilius* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Macquartia viridana* Robineau-Desvoidy.  
*Tachina perpingsens* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Elfia cingulata* (Robineau-Desvoidy).  
*Tachina quadricincta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Phryxe nemea* (Meigen).  
*Tachina reformata* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lydina aenea* (Meigen).  
*Tachina rejecta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Periscepsia spathulata* (Fallén).  
*Tachina retracta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Lydella grisescens* Robineau-Desvoidy.  
*Tachina reventa* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Dufouria chalybeata* (Meigen).  
*Tachina senta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Brachicoma devia* (Fallén) [Sarcophagidae].  
*Tachina titormus* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Macquartia dispar* (Fallén).  
*Tachina torta* Walker, **syn. n.** of *Macquartia praefica* (Meigen).

### New combinations

- Chetina ambivius* (Walker) **comb. n.**  
*Pseudoperichaeta nigrolineata* (Walker) **comb. n.**  
*Triarthria setipennis* (Fallén) **comb. n.**  
*Triarthria spinipennis* (Meigen) **comb. n.**

### SUMMARY OF CONFIRMED SYNONYMS

The following previously established synonymies have been confirmed.

- Dexia aurinia* Walker, junior syn. of *Dexia vacua* (Fallén).  
*Tachina admete* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina broteas* Walker, junior syn. of *Actia pilipennis* (Fallén).  
*Tachina cerceis* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina intercepta* Walker, junior syn. of *Phyto melanocephala* (Meigen) [Rhinophoridae].  
*Tachina internexa* Walker, junior syn. of *Pales pavidus* (Meigen).  
*Tachina intersita* Walker, junior syn. of *Nemorilla floralis* (Fallén).  
*Tachina medoacus* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina megaleas* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina mesula* Walker, junior syn. of *Demoticus plebejus* (Fallén).  
*Tachina nymphidius* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina pagasus* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina pamesos* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina philonis* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina piitho* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina separata* Walker, junior syn. of *Brachicoma devia* (Fallén) [Sarcophagidae].  
*Tachina telestho* Walker, junior syn. of *Exorista (Adenia) rustica* (Fallén).  
*Tachina thyamis* Walker, junior syn. of *Pelatachina tibialis* (Fallén).  
*Tachina tyche* Walker, junior syn. of *Phryxe vulgaris* (Fallén).

## SUMMARY OF NOMINA DUBIA

The following names remain *nomina dubia* because of inadequate descriptions and loss of types:

*Dexia fingens* Walker  
*Tachina augens* Walker  
*Tachina bijuncta* Walker  
*Tachina comitata* Walker  
*Tachina confecta* Walker  
*Tachina conjuncta* Walker  
*Tachina contracta* Walker  
*Tachina defecta* Walker (2)  
*Tachina demissa* Walker  
*Tachina detracta* Walker  
*Tachina disjuncta* Walker  
*Tachina dispartita* Walker  
*Tachina dispecta* Walker  
*Tachina dispuncta* Walker  
*Tachina distenta* Walker  
*Tachina divulsa* Walker  
*Tachina domator* Walker  
*Tachina effecta* Walker  
*Tachina emissa* Walker  
*Tachina enodata* Walker  
*Tachina enotata* Walker  
*Tachina erecta* Walker  
*Tachina erogata* Walker  
*Tachina evidens* Walker  
*Tachina evocata* Walker  
*Tachina evoluta* Walker  
*Tachina exacta* Walker  
*Tachina exagens* Walker

*Tachina exclusa* Walker  
*Tachina expetita* Walker [Rhinophoridae]  
*Tachina expleta* Walker  
*Tachina fissa* Walker  
*Tachina flexa* Walker  
*Tachina infestans* Walker  
*Tachina inoperta* Walker  
*Tachina inquilina* Walker  
*Tachina insedata* Walker  
*Tachina intacta* Walker  
*Tachina intaminata* Walker  
*Tachina intercedens* Walker  
*Tachina interclusa* Walker (1)  
*Tachina interclusa* Walker (2)  
*Tachina interlatens* Walker [Rhinophoridae]  
*Tachina intermixta* Walker  
*Tachina interna* Walker  
*Tachina intracta* Walker  
*Tachina involuta* Walker  
*Tachina multans* Walker  
*Tachina neglecta* Walker (1)  
*Tachina objecta* Walker  
*Tachina particeps* Walker  
*Tachina pertinens* Walker  
*Tachina pertracta* Walker [Sarcophagidae]  
*Tachina reclusa* Walker  
*Tachina resecta* Walker  
*Tachina viridulans* Walker

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank Dr Benno Herting, of the Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde, Ludwigsburg, for giving me the benefit of his opinion on a number of points that arose during the preparation of this paper, and in particular for confirming my identifications of two of Walker's types; I am grateful to him also for information on Meigen's type-specimens. I am much indebted to Dr Per Inge Persson for making several of Fallén's type-series available to me on loan from the Naturhistoriska Riksmuseum, Stockholm, and to Dr D. M. Wood, Entomology Research Institute, Ottawa, for forwarding to me one of Fallén's types that had been on loan to him from Stockholm. Dr Persson provided me with pertinent information on Fallén specimens standing in the Zetterstedt collection at Lund, as well as with information on specimens in Stockholm, and this was most helpful.

## REFERENCES

- AUSTEN, E. E. 1907. The synonymy and generic position of certain species of Muscidae (sens. lat.) in the collection of the British Museum, described by the late Francis Walker. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) **19** : 326-347.



- BEZZI, M. 1907. Tachinidae, pp. 189–597, in Becker, T., Bezzi, M., Kertész, K. & Stein, P., eds., *Katalog der Paläarktischen Dipteren* 3, 828 pp., Budapest. [Authorship of the volume is attributed on the title page to Bezzi & Stein, but in the 'Vorwort' to volume 4 of the *Katalog*, 1905, it is noted that Bezzi produced the Tachinidae section.]
- EMDEN, F. I. VAN 1954. Diptera Cyclorrhapha Calyptrata (1), Section (a) Tachinidae and Calliphoridae. *Handbk Ident. Br. Insects* 10, pt. 4(a), 133 pp.
- FABRICIUS, J. C. 1794. *Entomologia systematica emendata et aucta. Secundum classes, ordines, genera, species adjectis synonymis, locis, observationibus, descriptionibus*. 4. Copenhagen, 472 + 5 pp.
- FALLÉN, C. F. 1810. Försök att bestämma de i Sverige funne Flugarter, som kunna föras till Slägtet *Tachina*. *K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl.* [2] 31 : 253–287.
- 1816. Beskrifning Öfver de i Sverige funna Fluge Arter, som kunna föras till Slägtet *Musca*. Första afdelningen. *K. svenska VetenskAkad. Handl.* [3] 1816 : 226–254.
- 1820. *Monographia Muscidum sueciae*. Pp. 1–12, 13–24, 25–40. Lund.
- GISTL, J. 1848. *Naturgeschichte des Thierreichs. Für höhere Schulen*. Stuttgart, xvi + 216 pp.
- HERTING, B. 1972. Die Typenexemplare der von Meigen (1824–1838) beschriebenen Raupenfliegen (Dipt. Tachinidae). *Stuttg. Beitr. Naturk.* No. 243, 15 pp.
- KLOET, G. S. & HINCKS, W. D. 1945. *A check list of British insects*. Stockport, lix + 477 pp.
- LINNAEUS, C. 1758. *Systema naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis*. Ed. 10, 1, 824 pp. Stockholm.
- LIOY, P. 1864. I ditteri distribuiti secondo un nuovo metodo di classificazione naturale. *Atti Ist. veneto Sci.* (3) 9 : 1311–1352.
- MEIGEN, J. W. 1824. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten Europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten*. 4, xii + 428 pp., Hamm.
- 1826. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten Europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten*. 5, xii + 412 pp., Hamm.
- ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, J. B. 1830. Essai sur les Myodaires. *Mém. prés. div. Sav. Acad. Sci. Inst. Fr.* 2 : 1–1813.
- 1851. Myodaires des environs de Paris (suite) (1). *Annls Soc. ent. Fr.* (2) 9 : 177–190.
- 1863. *Histoire naturelle des Diptères des environs de Paris*. 1, 1143 pp., Paris.
- RONDANI, C. 1845. Descrizione di due generi nuovi di insetti ditteri. Memoria duodecima per servire alla ditterologia italiana. *Nuovi Annali Sci. nat., Bologna* (2) 3 : 25–36.
- 1856. Genera italica ordinis Dipteriorum ordinatim disposita et distincta et in familias et stirpes aggregata. *Dipterologiae italicae prodromus* 1, 266 pp. [+ 2 pp. unnumbered], Parma.
- SCOPOLI, J. A. 1763. *Entomologia carniolica exhibens insecta carnioliae indigena et distributa in ordines, genera, species, varietates. Methodo Linnaeana*. 420 pp. [+ 30 pp. unnumbered preface and index, + 1 p. unnumbered 'Notanda' and 'Errata'], Vienna.
- STEPHENS, J. F. 1829a. *The nomenclature of British insects; being a compendious list of such species as are contained in the systematic catalogue of British insects, and forming a guide to their classification, &c. &c.* 68 pp., London. [Published June, 1829].
- 1829b. *A systematic catalogue of British insects: being an attempt to arrange all the hitherto discovered indigenous insects in accordance with their natural affinities. Containing also the references to every English writer on entomology, and to the principal foreign authors. With all the published British genera to the present time. Part II [Insecta Haustellata]*, 388 pp., London. [Published July, 1829].
- VERRALL, G. H. 1888. *A list of British Diptera*. Part I, 33 pp.; part II, 4 pp., London.
- 1901. *A list of British Diptera*. Ed. 2, 47 pp., Cambridge.
- WALKER, F. 1849. *List of the specimens of dipterous insects in the collection of the British Museum* 4 : 689–1172.
- 1853. *Insecta britannica, Diptera* 2, vi + 297 pp. [+ 1 p. of 'Errata' unnumbered], London.

- WESTWOOD, J. O. 1838-1840. *An introduction to the modern classification of insects. Synopsis of the genera of British insects.* 158 pp., London.
- WHITE, A. 1853. *List of the specimens of British animals in the collection of the British Museum.* Part XV. Nomenclature of Diptera. I, 42 pp., London.
- ZETTERSTEDT, J. W. 1844. *Diptera scandinaviae disposita et descripta* 3 : 895-1280. Lund.

R. W. CROSSKEY, D.Sc., A.R.C.S., F.I.Biol.  
*Department of Entomology*  
BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY)  
CROMWELL ROAD  
LONDON SW7 5BD